National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXVI. NO. 8. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 1, 1865. WHOLE NO. 1308

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,
AT $3.00 PER ANNUM,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At its Office, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York,
AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE
PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
5 South Fifth Street, Philadelphia.

LETTERS should be addressed to *Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard*, 48 Beekman st., New York.

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as serve best to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its champions and apologists.

GOV. HOLDEN'S PROCLAMATION.

[From this long document we extract the portion relating to the colored people of North Carolina, printing it under its appropriate head.]

To the colored people of the State I would say, you are now free. Providence has willed that the very means adopted to render your servitude perpetual should be His instruments for releasing you from bondage. It now remains for you, aided as you will be by the superior intelligence of the white race, and cheered by the sympathies of all good people, to decide whether the freedom thus suddenly bestowed upon you will be a blessing to you or a source of injury. Your race has been depressed by your condition of slavery, and by the legislation of your former masters, for two hundred years. It is not to be expected that you can comprehend and appreciate, as they should be comprehended and appreciated by a self-governing people, the wise provisions and limitations of constitutions and laws; or that you can now have that knowledge of public affairs which is necessary to qualify you to discharge all the duties of the citizen. No people has ever yet bounded at once into the full enjoyment of the right of self-government. But you are free in common with all our people, and you have the same right, regulated by law, that others have, to enter upon the pursuit of prosperity and happiness. You should henceforth sacredly observe the marriage relation, and you should provide for your offspring. You can now not only learn to read yourselves, as some of you have been able to do heretofore, but you can instruct others, and procure instruction from others for yourselves and your children, without fear of punishment. But to be prosperous and happy, you must labor, not merely when you feel like it, or for a scanty support, but industriously and steadily, with a view to making and laying up something for yourselves and families. If your are idle, you will become vicious and worthless; if vicious and worthless, you will have no friends, and will at last perish. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread all the days of thy life." The same Providence that has bestowed freedom upon you, has told you that diligence in business is required of all His creatures, and you cannot expect that your race will escape ultimate extinction, if you wilfully violate or disregard this one of His great commands. Freedom does not mean that one may do as he pleases, but that every one may, by industry, frugality, and temperance, improve his condition and enjoy the fruits of his own labors, so long as he obeys the laws. I have no prejudice against you. On the contrary, while I am a white man, and while my lot is with my own color, yet I sympathize with you as the weaker race; and I cannot forget that during the Rebellion many of you fought for the preservation of the Union, and that those of you who remained at home in the then Slaveholding States were, for the most part, docile and faithful, and made no attempt by force of arms to gain even your freedom. I will see to it, as far as I can, that you have your liberty; that you are protected in your property and persons, and that you are paid your wages. But, on the other hand, I will set my face against those of you who are idle and dissipated, and prompt punishment will be inflicted for any breach of the peace or violation of law. In fine, I will be your friend as long as you are true to yourselves and obedient to the laws, and as long as you shall labor, no matter how feebly, if honestly and earnestly, to improve your condition. It is my duty, as far as I may, to render the Government "a terror to evil-doers and a praise to them that do well;" and this I will endeavor to do in relation to the whole people of the State of North Carolina, "without fear, favor, or affection, reward, or the hope of reward."

THE NEGRO.

From the New York Times.

It is decreed that the negro shall occupy the attention of the American people. For thirty years he has been the great topic of discussion. His rights as a man; his wrongs as a slave; his *status* among the races; his intellectual calibre; his moral possibilities; his physiological peculiarities; his hair and his heels; his color and his odor; his history and his future, have been questions concerning which every man and all women were supposed to be thoroughly posted and ceaselessly excited. Nay, his body, soul, and earthly relations were not enough for the speculators. Sweeping beyond this world and into the next, they argued as to whether, when he got to Heaven, he would occupy the same quarters as the white man, and be permitted to sit on the same bench.

The questions before the public often seemed to vary; but under and behind them all was always the same old question—the negro. There was an African behind every fence, a darkey in every wood-pile. Without the negro, Congressmen would have had nothing to spout and shout about, except questions of national development, national progress, and national glory; without him, the preachers (some of them) would have been hard up for a theme; without him, what would the newspapers (some of them) have done? But for him, there would have been no Southern Confederacy; the late war would never have been waged; our present debt would not have been piled up; and Jeff. Davis' neck would never have been in danger, (possibly not.)

So important a part has he played in our history, that it is impossible even to conceive what our history would have been without him. Had that "dark bark," which was "rigged with curses" and crammed with Ethiopians, never have been permitted to reach our shores; and had the trade ended with that accursed freight, what would have been the state of the South? what the character of our politics? what our whole past career? The subject would be an excellent one for debate in young men's lyceums, but it is altogether beyond our depth.

Some of the phases of the great discussion, which have harassed the nation for years, have been settled by the war; but others are as far from settlement as ever, and new phases are continually arising. We shall hear no more, for example, of the wrongs of the negro as a slave; but we are as far as ever from having established his *status* among the races of men, or solved the problems concealed in his physical conformation. The vast system of negro education has settled the dispute as to the capacity of the negro for intellectual development, at least so far as concerns his capacity of achieving the three famous R's, "reading, riteing, and rithmetic;" but how does that help us to decide the tastefulness or propriety of amalgamation? We have but lately settled the question of the negro's right to be a soldier; but we have only got fairly into the dispute as to the wisdom of conferring upon him the franchises of a citizen. When the latter ceases to be a practical and political phase of the one great question, we shall have some other phase of it before the country. What it will be, remains to be seen.

Beside the leading matter just referred to, we are never without exciting news specially bearing upon negroes. To-day, there is the deputation to the President of Richmond negroes; the negro soldier meeting on the James River; the accounts from the South of the unfixed and unhappy condition of negroes generally, and other things too numerous to be here mentioned. It is evident that this whole negro question can only be got rid of by getting rid of the negroes; and as this is impossible, we must rest content with our lot. In the meantime, it would be well for those of us who are white not to lose sight entirely of the fact.

Selections.

THE SUFFRAGE IN MISSISSIPPI.

From the Chicago Tribune, June 19.

The important political act of President Johnson's administration thus far, is the insertion of the following proviso against negro suffrage, in his proclamations of reconstruction for North Carolina and Mississippi:

> Provided, that in any election that may be held hereafter for choosing delegates to any State convention as aforesaid, no person shall be qualified as an elector, or shall be eligible as a member of such convention, unless he shall have previously taken and subscribed the oath of amnesty as set forth in the President's proclamation of May 29, A. D. 1865, *and is a voter qualified and prescribed by the constitution and laws of the State of Mississippi, in force immediately before the 9th of January, A. D. 1861, the date of the so-called ordinance of secession.* And the said convention when convened, or the legislature that may be hereafter assembled, will prescribe the qualifications of electors and the eligibility of persons to hold office under the constitution and laws of the State—a power the people of the several states composing the Federal Union have rightfully exercised from the origin of the government to the present time.

Either the President had or had not the power to determine whether negro citizens should vote. If he had that power, he had the same power to determine that they should as that they should not vote; for a power to decide a question in only one way is no power at all—the question being already decided.

If the President had not the power to decide the question, it must be because his power was limited by some constitution or law in force at the time he issued his proclamation. The President refers to "the constitution and laws of the State of Mississippi, in force immediately before the 9th day of January, A. D. 1861, the date of the so-called ordinance of secession." There is no intermediate state between a law in force and a law not in force. The former cannot be held null—the latter cannot be resurrected except by the legislative power. If the constitution and laws of Mississippi in force on the 9th day of January, 1861, are now in force, then President Johnson has no power to appoint a Governor of that State. If they are not now in force, then there was no necessity that he should adopt them as the basis of the right of suffrage, more than of the right of electing their own Govenor. But he admits that they are not now in force, not only by appointing a Governor in violation of them, but by referring to them not as in force now, but as having been in force prior to the ordinance of secession.

And admit for argument's sake that the President has the lawful power to exclude unpardoned rebels from taking part in the reconstruction of the State Government, where does he get his authority to exclude any class of loyal citizens, or to discriminate among those who support the Government? The blacks are free men and American citizens, and their warm attachment to the Constitution and the Union is conceded. They also constitute a large majority of the whole population of Mississippi. We repeat the question, where does the President obtain his authority to exclude these loyal American citizens from the polls, in the preliminary organization of that State?

But the President says the future "Convention" and "Legislature" of the State "will prescribe the qualifications of electors, etc.," "a power the people of the several States comprising the Federal Union, have rightfully exercised from the origin of the Government to the present time."

If the people, *i. e.* the whole people of the States have so long rightfully exercised this power, and if the President means to conform his proclamation to this right of theirs, why does the President now take it out of their hands and exercise it himself? Why does he by this very provision limit the suffrage to less than half the people of those States? In the name of "states rights" he does for the people of a State what he declares they have always heretofore done for themselves? If this were done on behalf of negro suffrage instead of against it, would it not be called by some, executive usurpation, and a violation of the rights of the States?

The people of a State are the citizens of the United States residing within its borders. When the ordinance of secession was passed Mississippi contained 353,901 whites, who formed the people of Mississippi—733 free blacks, whose citizenship, under the Dred Scott decision, was doubtful and unimportant, and 436,631 slaves, who were then not citizens but chattels, and therefore formed no part of the "people of Mississippi." During the war, the white population, by refugees, removals, and deaths caused by war, has considerable diminished—certainly to 300,000; very possibly to 250,000. On the other hand, many negroes from the border States have been driven into Mississippi, enough doubtless, after offsetting the losses by all means, to raise the present negro population of the State to 500,000. Upon these data "the people of Mississippi" of the date of the ordinance of secession form but one-third of the present "people of Mississippi."

To state that the principle of government by the people is vindicated when a constitution and laws made by the former are imposed by the President on the latter is an obvious fiction and falsehood. But when we reflect that of the white third of the people of Mississippi, every soul, so far as is known, were secessionists and rebels, while only the black two-thirds are really in favor of the National Union, it is hard to see how the reconstruction of the State, on the basis of placing the feet of the white rebels on the necks of the black Unionists, can be safe either for emancipation or the Union.

It is further to be understood that while the blacks are excluded from the suffrage, they count as full men in the representation in Congress, and in electing the President. Hence the white (rebel) third of the people of Mississippi would have three three times the voting power of the citizens of the Northern States. Here, 127,000 inhabitants must elect a representative in Congress or a Presidential elector. There, the white 42,000 out of that number would have that power, since they would vote for the other two-thirds. The vote of the other two-thirds would be, if cast according to their inclinations, for liberty and the Union. But cast by the ex-slaveholding rebels, it will be a solid copperhead vote for slavery, disunion, and repudiation of the national debt. It cannot be said that Northern voters are to "let alone" a policy which gives the ex-rebels of the South power to cast, in effect, three votes to a Northern man's one.

But if it be asked what guide the President could adopt upon the question of suffrage, we answer, he could have adopted the constitution and laws of all the States, except South Carolina, in force immediately after the adoption of the Federal Constitution and before the heat of the slavery question warped and twisted them till the rights of man ran through their yawning fissures and were lost.

South Carolina never had a Republican constitution, and hence is no precedent; but every other State entered the Union with a constitution which, whatever its provisions on the suffrage question, excluded none on account of color.

Thus the Declaration of Rights in the Constitution of Delaware declared:

> "Every freeman having sufficient evidence of permanent common interests, with an attachment to the community, hath a right of suffrage."

The Constitution of Maryland provides:

> "All freemen above twenty-one years of age, having a freehold of fifty acres of land in the county in which they offer to vote, and residing therein, and all freemen, having property in this State above the value of thirty pounds current money, and having resided in the county in which they offer to vote one whole year next preceding the election, shall have the right of suffrage in the election of delegates for such county."

The Virginia Declaration of Rights provides:

> "All men having sufficient evidence of permanent common interest, with an attachment to the community, have a right of suffrage."

The Constitution of North Carolina contains this provision:

> "All freedmen of the age of twenty-one years, who have been inhabitants of any one county within the State twelve months immediately preceding the day of any election, and shall have paid public taxes, shall be entitled to vote for members of the House of Commons for the county in which they reside."

The Constitution of Georgia declares that:

> "The electors of the members of both branches of the General Assembly shall be citizens and inhabitants of this State, and shall have attained the age of twenty-one years, and have paid tax for the year preceding the election, and shall have resided six months within the county."

So colored men voted in Pennsylvania till 1838; in Connecticut till 1817; in New York on the same footing with the whites till 1826, and since then with property qualification; and in the other Eastern States without hindrance. Also in Maryland till 1833, and in North Carolina and Tennessee till about the same period. It is only when we come to the State of South Carolina, whose people never voted for President, and unless worth ten slaves, or $10,000, did not vote at all, that we find in the constitutions of those days the word white.

> "The qualifications of an elector shall be every free *white* man, and *no other person,*" etc.

The exclusion of negroes from the suffrage was the result of the dictation of slavery, and became a policy about the years 1828 to '38. Nothing should be more obvious, in reconstructing States in which slavery is intended to be abolished, than the propriety of adopting those principles of suffrage in vogue before slavery ruled the country, *i. e.*, immediately after the adoption of the Federal Constitution. Instead of this, the President has adopted the rule in force when slavery was in the culmination of its power, and in the very act of seceding. *Evidently there was nothing to require this choice but his own inilination.*

Its inevitable tendency is, in our judgment, to restore the rebels to power and the negroes to slavery, to undo the work of the past war and involve us in a new one. We shrink from the contemplation of the effects of the policy thus inaugurated. The public mind is deeply apprehensive of the result. At least, such a policy should not be adopted in obedience to any "one man power" without the faintest indication of sanction from any portion of the people but Copperheads, and with the certainty that it will be repudiated by Congress.

PIOUS PERJURY.

From the Missouri Democrat, June 13.

The declaration that "treason is the sum of all villanies" received yesterday a new and strong confirmation. Thousands of men marched boldly up to the polls in this city—some of them but recently from the rebel camps, and all of them sympathizers and abettors of the rebellion during the entire continuance of the war—and made oath before God and man that they never had been anything else but loyal citizens of the government of the United States. They swore that they never had been in armed hostility to the government—had never given aid or comfort to the enemies of the government—had never contributed by money, goods, letters, or information to the cause of the rebellion—had never advised or aided any person to enter the service of the rebellion—had never, by act or word, manifested a desire for the triumph of the rebellion—had never been in the service of the rebellion—had never left the State to join the armies of the rebellion—had never been connected with any order, society, or organization inimical to this State or the General Government—had never been guerillas or bushwhackers, or knowingly and willingly harbored or aided such—had never left the State or come into it for the purpose of avoiding enrolment or military service—had never received or sought, under claim of alienage, the protection of any foreign government, in order to secure exemption from military duty, after having voted previously at any poll in the States or Territories.

[The Hannibal (Wis.) *Courier* supplies to the foregoing the following illustration:]

Gen. John McNeil was in Hannibal on election-day, and appeared at the Court-house precinct to vote. He informed the Judges that he was now about to take the prescribed oath, and "swear to a G—d d—d lie." But all the perjury connected with this swearing be held to lie upon the souls of those who prescribed the oath, and not upon himself. He presented, however, as a palliation to his conscience, the following curious document in the shape of a protest against the oath. The General's school of casuistry is a novel one; and, if it holds good in relation to one species of violation of law, real or supposed, we do not see why it should not extend to all others where "necessity" should demand it.

PROTEST.

HANNIBAL, MO., June 6, 1865—I, John McNeil, of the City and County of St. Louis, State of Missouri, being in the City of Hannibal, Missouri, and desiring to vote on the question of the adoption of the Constitution proposed by the late Constitutional Convention of the State of Missouri, hereby enter my solemn protest against the oath proposed in Section 69, Article 2d of said Constitution.

In this: that I have been in arms against the government of the State of Missouri, and sundry times between the 8th of May, 1861, and the day when said government was righteously deposed by the Constitutional Convention of the State of Missouri, to wit: I commanded a regiment that participated in the capture of Camp Jackson, a "Rebel gathering," but a legally authorized camp of the State of Missouri, at the time acting under order of one Nathaniel Lyon, and in consort with Frank Blair, Frank Sigel, and others and at other times operating against said government until its deposition by said Constitutional Convention.

JOHN MCNEIL.

MR. ASHLEY AND THE PRESIDENT.

[The Hon. James M. Ashley, a Radical Republican Member of Congress from Ohio, gives the following report of his recent interview with President Johnson.]

"I recently went to Washington—at my own expense, of course, as I have always gone—to present what I conceive are the views of the earnest men of the country to the President. In the interview which I had with him—with other gentlemen, and an interview with him alone—I formed the belief that the President desires earnestly to carry out the wishes of the Union men of the country. I asked him to withdraw the amnesty proclamation of Mr. Lincoln, so that the rebels who had committed treason since its issue should not have the benefit of its promises or provisions. I asked him to withdraw it so that these rebels could not demand, as a right, the benefit of that proclamation. I asked him to do so because I believed that no executive officer has the power of issuing a pardon in advance of the crime to any one. We succeeded. Every condition the earnest men asked for was put into the new proclamation. Upon only one question did we differ, and that was on the question whether, upon the reconstruction or reorganization of the rebel governments, the colored soldiers and colored loyal citizens should be allowed to vote, or whether, because of the color of their skin, they were to be excluded from this privilege. While professing to desire, in his interview with us, that all men should vote, without distinction of color, the President embarrassed himself and us with this idea—that the States which had been in rebellion are still States, or, in other words, that the governments of these States were not destroyed, but were only in abeyance, and that when the rebellion was suppressed, or the laws and Constitution revived, neither he nor Congress had any authority to prescribe the qualifications of electors in those States. I replied to him by saying that while I had no disposition to press any theory of my own—willing as I was to subordinate any such theories to the accomplishment of the great purpose in view—I said to him frankly, that his decision was antagonistic to two decisions made by the Supreme Court—one by Chief Justice Taney, and the other by Chief Justice Chase. I said to him, according to the dicta of these judges, that he could as readily enfranchise the black man as disfranchise the white, for that, under the Constitution, or any law of Congress, he had no power but the military power to say who should or who should not vote at the preliminary elections for reconstruction; that if he could exclude one man as a voter under the Constitution, he could exclude ten thousand, and that if he could admit any one man to vote he could admit all loyal men without regard to color. I need not tell you what the answer was to that. I merely said to him that the anti-slavery party had destroyed the old whig and democratic parties; that the wrecks of these parties were now scattered and strewn along the political coast; and that we intended, under God, to crush any party or any man who stood up against the universal enfranchisement of the country. And, gentlemen, I went to Virginia on invitation, and I remained among the people, and I became satisfied that, under the arrangements of the executive, the rebels would take possession of the new government, as they have done; and I said that there was no way of escaping from the dilemma, unless by the President constituting himself military governor. The State is now completely in the hands of men who, forty days ago, were in rebellion against the government; and this will be so in every rebel State. They will assume the Rebel Debt as part of the State Debt; they will adopt a system of laws which, even if the constitutional amendment be adopted, will practically enslave the black man as much as ever. What is our duty under the circumstances? I would counsel our friends to forbearance and kindness, but earnestness; and then, with the press of the country taking up the matter, we may bring the administration of President Johnson to the right point, as the anti-slavery men brought President Lincoln, after a contest of two years."

HOLDEN'S PROCLAMATION.

From the N. Y. Tribune, June 21.

We are often reminded by modern public documents of a scene in one of Neal's "Charcoal Sketches," where a watchman lectures a festive and oblivious chap whom he finds holding up a lamppost and very often threatening to thresh the ground. "How *can* you persist in making a beast of yourself?" is the policeman's natural, indignant query—"you who were so well bred, and have such a nice, likely family at home"—"Now, don't, watchy," interrupts the prodigal—"don't give me any more good advice. I know more good advice than any man in town." And so, if the Blacks haven't learned by this time that "freedom means freedom to work"—that idleness leads to starvation—that it is honorable to be diligent and shameful to be indolent, &c.,—then they must be the most stolid and perverse of all beings; for never, even in Slavery's palmiest days, were "Servants, obey your masters" and the few kindred precepts worked harder, or made to assume graver importance, than "He that doth not work, neither shall he eat," during the last few weeks. If the Southern Blacks fail to realize by this time that if they are henceforth to live free, they must work, their skulls must be thicker than any potash kettle. It must bother them at first to see just how it happens that those whom they have seen doing next to nothing for all their past lives are nevertheless comfortable, consequential, and empowered, though scarcely yet pardoned Rebels, to vote them, the steadfast workers of the past, into nonentity for uncounted years to come. If they were White, they might possibly see around this corner, but being "niggers," you know, and ever so stupid, they can hardly be blamed that it does not get through their wool.

Gov. Holden tells them that they are free, and "have the same *right*, regulated by law, that others have, to enter upon the pursuit of prosperity and happiness." "Jest so," says Solon Shingle; but have they the same *opportunity?* Suppose they generally follow the Governor's good advice, and fall zealously to work for the best wages they can get: having earned $50 to $500 each, how are they to compel or insure its payment? They are to have no voice in making, no hand in executing, the laws; no place in the jury-box, much less on the bench; they have as yet no right on the witness-stand in a case whereto a White is party: what is their chance of justice against any white scoundrel who chooses to eat *his* bread in the sweat of *their* faces instead of his own? The Governor talks anything but turkey to them.

But, he tells them, "No people has ever yet bounded *at once* into the full enjoyment of self-government." Admit it (though it isn't the fact); what then? If they are not to "bound" to that goal, so much the more reason that they should begin to creep toward it. Yes, and the more reason also that they should be authoritatively told: "Be diligent; be loyal; be patient; be frugal; acquire knowledge and educate your children, and you *shall* be enfranchised so fast as you shall be qualified to exercise the franchise intelligently and usefully." No word of this does Gov. Holden say—not, we presume, because he would not, but because he dare not. He would prefer, we think, to be just; but his paramount desire is to retain his office by a popular re-election. And there stand the late Rebel leaders, beaten but still venomous, and watching for a chance to ride into power again on a fresh popular excitement. Only give them a chance to cry "Down with the Nigger party!" and they will feel confident that the Millennium is at hand. Gov. Holden and his Union party dare not face this issue if they would; so they will leave the Blacks under the feet of the late Rebels, who will soon be ready to trample him and his supporters under in their turn. Or, if North Carolina is too sound for this, the White Unionists of most other Southern States are exposed to that very fate, and will meet it with a consciousness that they have in part deserved it. For, while there is no single State in the South—not even South Carolina—that is not preponderantly loyal, the suppression and political annihilation of the Blacks, who are *all* Unionists, will make most of them ostensibly *dis*loyal, and will fill their seats in Congress with representatives who are Unionists only because they can no longer afford to be anything else—men who will regard the National Debt as a monument not of National deliverance but of National overthrow and subjugation. Such is the necessary effect of anti-Negro "reconstruction."

Gov. Holden's Address to the colored population of North Carolina is a master-piece of Pecksniffianism. Be virtuous and you will be happy, says this fatherly Governor. You can't expect to enjoy the rights of citizens; but we, the superior and governing race, will look lovingly after your true interests. There is a fable of a considerate and benevolent cook who once called the chickens into Convention, and with great gravity requested them to give their opinions as to the proper way in which they should be eaten. The old process, he said, had occasioned needless pain to them and much indigestion to consumers, and he should like the benefit of their wisdom on so important a point. Then a pert pullet squeaked out, "we don't want to be eaten at all!" But she was instantly put down by the chairman's grave rebuke: "You wander from the point." We commend the fable to Gov. Holden. It "was sometime a paradox, but now the time gives it proof."—*Boston Transcript.*

FROM NORTH CAROLINA.

Correspondence of the N. Y. Tribune.

GOV. HOLDEN'S PROCLAMATION.—INDUSTRY AND EXEMPLARINESS OF THE FREEDMEN.—THEIR CROPS.—MILITARY RULE.—OUTCROPPINGS OF BARBARISM.

GREENSBOROUGH, N. C., June 14, 1865.

HEREWITH I send Gov. Holden's "Proclamation to the People of North Carolina." Its value would have been somewhat enhanced if he had said a few wholesome words to master as well as servant. The lion's share of good advice falls to the colored race, for which they doubtless should be duly grateful. If they go astray in the matter of their duty, if they fail to be pious, industrious, and chaste, or to exhibit in their character and conduct all the Christian graces, it will not be for lack of admonition. Every officer, from a village Provost-Marshal to Major-Generals and Governers, has a homily for the black man. If the "self-governing" race will be half as liberal or just in the bestowment of employment and wages as they are lavish of good counsel, the freed people will soon become as remarkable for intelligence and thrift as they are now assumed to be ignorant and improvident. Apropos of this subject: the colored people of Greensborough, listening to the good advice from all these sources, began to send their children to school a short time since. Capt. G. A. Lyon, Chief Quartermaster of the Twenty-third Corps, and Post Quartermaster of this place, upon application, appropriated an old vacant building near the depot for the purpose of a school-room for the colored children. The property belonged to ex-Gov. Morehead, who, a day or two since, applied to the military authorities to have the building restored to him. Gen. Carter ordered Major Smith, the Superintendent of Freedmen, to have the building cleared instantly, which was done, and the school was broken up. The parents and patrons of the school applied for the use of the M. E. Church, of which many of them are members, but they were refused its use.

Gov. Holden, in his proclamation, tells these people they "can learn to read" themselves, "and also instruct others." If they succeed in doing so, they will be entitled to unusual credit in the face of such obstacles as these.

The eagerness of these freed people to learn to read, and to have their children instructed, is one of the remarkable incidents of their new-found freedom, and is only equalled by the apparent hostility—I will not say intentional opposition—which their efforts meet with from the "superior" and "stronger" class. I feel a sincere regret that any portion of this apparently unfriendly spirit should be exhibited by officers of high rank in the Union army.

During the past week, I have paid a visit to Charlotte, passing over the ninety odd miles of railroad between this and that place, and judging from the extensive and thrifty fields of corn and already harvested wheat I saw along the way, it is evident the freed blacks are following the good advice which they receive. Not only men and boys, but women and girls were everywhere observed working patiently and hopefully in the fields. Not one white person in ten could be counted at work on the farms.

At Linwood, the estate of Mr. Holt—some call him General—the finest farm I have ever seen in the Southern States, and which I think equal to any in the Lebanon Valley, I was told that not one of his five hundred and odd acres has suffered for lack of hands to work it. He called his workmen around him, informed them they were free, and agreed to pay them wages for their labor. Former good treatment, and confidence in their late master, joined with a creditable pride in their beautiful farm, kept them all at home. Other instances of the same kind are numerous. The crops, though planting in many instances was late, will yield a good return throughout the southern and middle portions of the States, but they will be chiefly required for home consumption. But very little cotton has been planted. I saw but one small patch in the line from Greensborough to Charlotte. They needed no edict from Jeff. Davis, or any one else, to plant corn. The universal cry for bread which is already heard, was enough.

A Military Commission, composed of Col. McQuiston, Second Brigade, First Division, Twenty-third Army Corps, who presides, with several associate officers, sits *en permanence* at Charlotte for the hearing and settlement of disputes arising between citizens—in the absence of civil courts. The pleadings in these are often unique in their way, but are generally required to be brief, and confined to a statement of facts. Questions of trade and titles to property are frequent, and often involve transactions made in Confederate currency before the great collapse.

A simple appeal to the equities of the case generally settles these disputes, and the parties retire as well satisfied as if they had spent a long season and much money in a court of law. Domestic feuds, wife desertion or whipping, are not uncommon, and occasional practices by some self-constituted patrol or magistrate of the old slave code, which the people in these parts have not been officially notified as yet is abolished require attention.

One of these consequential conservators of the public peace met a "nigger" in the road, a few days since, and demanded his pass. The "nigger" laughed, handed out Gen. Schofield's celebrated order No. 32, "to remove doubt," and white man says, "looked insolent." Hereupon white man takes away "nigger's" cane, and with assistance of another *brave*, strips and gives "nigger" "thirty-nine lashes well laid on," according to law. Complaint was made to the Provost Marshal, who turns the case over, with the evidence, to Col. McQuiston's court. In defense, the accused put in a written plea upon the Constitution—not of the "nigger," but of the United States, and quoted largely from Judge Story and other learned authorities.

A slaveholder, whose name I prefer at present to suppress, living sixteen miles east of Charlotte, Mecklenberg County, last Wednesday, "bucked" and whipped a woman in a most unmerciful manner, and when he got tired, his wife continued the flagellation until (amiable creature) she also became exhausted. The woman had been the mother of several children. She left the next day, and with difficulty reached Charlotte, where she stated her grievances to the Provost Marshal. He told her she needn't go back!

A planter, eleven miles north of Charlotte, on the old Statesville road, tied his slave upon a rail and kept him confined until next day, Tuesday. The slave-man had left the plantation, and had hired to work on another place, which was the provocation for the whipping. His former owner followed him to the farm—Wilson's—took him away by force, and punished him as described. He probably had not read Gen. Schofield's order No. 32, "to remove doubt."

THE GREAT QUESTION—NEGRO SUFFRAGE.

From the Indianapolis Daily Gazette, June 16.

Shall the negroes vote? That is to be the great question and issue in our politics before very long. Our people are already beginning to discuss the question and to take sides on it. Which side shall *you* and *I* take? Better ask *which is right?*

It is a delicate question and a difficult one. In theory it may be easy enough; but how is it in practice? It may not always be practicable to do what is right. Such at least is the doctrine of some. We will not endorse the sentiment unconditionally, for we do not know that it is really true.

We do know however, or think we do, that there is difficulty in the way of negro suffrage, just at this time; and yet we do not know but it would be better to let the negroes vote than to undertake to debar them from the right. But is it a right?

We are told—what seems to be the common idea—that the elective franchise is not a *right* but a *privilege.* But is this true? We used to think so—that is, we assented to it before we gave the subject any special thought. But we do not think so now. We maintain that in a government like ours, a republican government or government of *the people*, the elective franchise, as it is called, is not a mere privilege, but an actual and absolute *right*—a right belonging, of right, to every free man who has not forfeited that right by crime. We in this country enjoy what is properly called self-government, and self-government necessarily implies the *right to vote,*—the right to *help to govern* and to make the laws; and this, in a government like ours—a government of the people, can only be done by or through the elective franchise. We maintain that in self-government, or government of the people, every man who is a free man and citizen has a right to assist and take part in that government. This right inheres and belongs to every man alike, to you and me, and every other man, no matter what the color of his skin,—if he be a free man and citizen, and helps to support the government by paying taxes; it is one of the fundamental priciples of self-government and of a democratic or republican government. But the elective franchise, the right to choose and elect the men who are to fill the offices and make the laws and execute them, lies at the very bottom of such government. It is the first principle and starting point, and is as much implied in the very name and idea of self-government or *government of the people*, as any other principle, right, or idea, pertaining to such a government. Does any one doubt this? Let him ask himself what constitutes a republican government or government of the people, and what is implied by such a government, and he will soon see that without the elective franchise or right to choose rulers and law-makers, there can be no such government. It will not do therefore to call this right a privilege. If it is but a privilege, all may be deprived of its exercise. What sort of a republican or self-government would that be in which none of the people were allowed to vote? But if it is but a privilege, and granted to but a class or part, it may be restricted to a still smaller part, and finally allowed to none!

We care not what objections you may make, on the ground that certain classes of the white population always have been and always must be excluded from the ballot box, as women, for instance, and minors. We care not how this matter of the right or propriety of women voting is understood or settled, so far as our present argument is concerned. As we have said, it does not bear upon our proposition one way or the other. All that we contend for is that every *man*, in a government like ours, has a right to vote. Not a natural, but a political right—a right necessarily implied by the very nature of that government. Hence we only maintain that the colored man has this right the same as the white man—other things being equal. If you establish the right for woman to vote, then all we can say is that you extend the right to the colored woman also.

As to minors—the same may be said. The fact that young men are not allowed to vote or take part in the elections, until of a certain age, does not militate a particle against the principle we have laid down and which we maintain. It is evident enough that some age must be fixed upon before which the youthful man shall not be allowed to vote. You may say 21 years is too much. We will agree with you and say that eighteen is enough. But at ten years is probably too soon, and certainly at five is. So you see we must necessarily fix upon some time in the age of the young man or minor at which he can come into his right to exercise the elective franchise, and take part in matters of self-government. But when he reaches that age he has a *right* to such franchise—to vote. It is his, and guaranteed to him, by the very nature of our Government, as it is the right of every free man and citizen in the nation.

The reader will therefore conclude that we are in favor of negro suffrage. We are. And yet we freely admit that there are great difficulties in the way of granting or permitting the exercise of such right—especially at this time. We know it and see it all. But we have made the negro a free man and of course a *citizen:* or he soon will be such. According to our idea of republican government, every male citizen, over a certain age, is legally entitled to the exercise of the elective franchise—or ought to be. We also look forward and see that we *must come to this*, sooner or later. We must and will allow the freed colored man the right to vote at the elections and take part in what is *his* as well as *our* government. In this article we place the matter upon the ground of RIGHT. We wish to excite investigation upon the question as to whether the elective franchise, in our government, is a *privilege* or a *right*, and, if possible, help to correct public opinion upon the subject; for, in our opinion, it is certainly an error to hold that it is but a privilege, as seems to be the common understanding or idea of the matter. It is a *right*—an absolute and inalienable right—forfeited only by crime—belonging to every male citizen of proper age, of a republican government. Let this fact be established, and the colored citizen as well as the white, will eventually be accorded the exercise of this, the first and greatest right of a free citizen. There are other reasons, however, in favor of negro suffrage, and more imperative just now, perhaps, than this, some of which we will notice hereafter.

FANEUIL HALL SPEAKS.

THE CONSERVATIVES OF BOSTON DEMAND THE BALLOT FOR THE BLACKS.

A great meeting was held last week in Boston, Faneuil Hall, to consider the question of reorganization. Theophilus Parsons presided, and on taking the chair, addressed the meeting in substance as follows:

THEOPHILUS PARSONS' SPEECH.

The greatest rebellion the world has ever seen has been defeated and suppressed by the greatest efforts a nation ever made. And it has left behind it questions as momentous as any that a nation was ever called upon to answer, so momentous that our destiny for ages probably depends upon our answer to these questions. We have met to-day to consider them. They are numerous; but to my mind they all cluster around one central question. What shall we do with the emancipated slaves? What have we the right to do? What is it our duty to do?

THE VICTORS TO DICTATE TERMS.

As we are victorious in war, we have a right to impose upon the defeated party any terms necessary for our security. This right is perfect. It is not only in itself obvious, but it is asserted in every book on this subject, and is illustrated by all the wars of history. The rebels forced a war upon us, it was a long and costly and bloody war; and now that we have conquered them, we have all the rights which victory confers. I admit but one question; Does our security require that we should insist upon freedman suffrage? On this point I will suggest but one thing. We greatly increase by the emancipation of the slaves the congressional force of the Southern States. They will cast about one third of all the votes; and if they stand together and vote as a unit, they will need only about one sixth more to get and hold control over national legislation and all our foreign and domestic policy.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE—OUR ONLY SECURITY.

If the question of freedman suffrage is left open, persistent and widespread agitation is inevitable. It will certainly replace slavery as the great question on which parties will organize. And then it will inevitably cause the former slave States to stand together and vote together as one. Who can doubt that they will get all the aid they want from those in the free States who will seek to ride into power on this or any other question? The same predominant influence which has governed this country for many years will govern it again, and with the same absolute dominion. And for what purpose will they govern it? For one purpose, certainly; for the repudiation of our debt. This debt now presses with a heavy burden of taxation upon an impatient people unaccustomed to the burden. They who will be the ruling portion of the ruling party will not forget that their own vast war debt was destroyed by our victories. They will find themselves called upon to pay their share of another great war debt, and they will not forget that it was incurred for their subjugation.

How can any man doubt that this party will assail this debt and the taxation it makes necessary, with all their might, and with all the means which can be devised or found or used? And are we indeed bound to give by means of this suffrage question, unity and solidity to a party which must aim persistently at the insolvency of the country, and the prostration of the vast pecuniary interests which now rest upon the credit of the country? Can any rational man believe we have no right to lessen, so far as we may, this danger? to demand, to insist upon, and to have all the security we can have against an ineffable disgrace—an intolerable calamity?

NO SAFETY FOR THE BLACKS BUT IN THE BALLOT.

I believe our rights may well be established on this argument. I wish, however, to rest them on a still surer foundation. The rebellion has compelled us to abolish slavery for our security. We have done this. But the slaves were always to a considerable degree protected, supported and defended by the self-interest of their owners. All this we take utterly from them. And then if we withhold from them all political right, we withhold from them all power of self-protection and self-defence. We give to the whites with whom they live the whole power of legislation over the freedmen and against the freedmen. We say to them, we leave you in exclusive possession of the whole of this power, because we look upon the freedmen as a degraded race; we give you full power to keep them down on that dead level of ignorance and debasement to which slavery sank them, as long as you see fit; and as long as you keep them there you shall be their masters! What more wrongful, what more cruel thing could we do toward the whites as well as toward the blacks?

SLAVERY WILL RETURN IN ANOTHER NAME.

Some of the Southern States have among their statutes a law prohibiting the education of a colored man under a heavy penalty. The whole world calls this most inhuman, most infamous. And shall we say to the whites of those States, we give you complete and exclusive power of legislating about the education of the blacks; but beware; for if you lift them by education from their present condition, you do it under the penalty of forfeiting and losing your supremacy? Will not slavery, with nearly all its evil, and with none of its compensation, come back at once:—not under its own detested name; it will call itself apprenticeship; it will put on the disguise of laws to prevent pauperism, by providing that every colored man who does not work in some prescribed way shall be arrested and placed at the disposal of the authorities; or it will do its work by means of laws regulating wages and labor. However it be done, one thing is certain. If we take from the slaves all the protection and defence they found in slavery, and withhold from them all power of self-protection and self-defence, the race must perish and we shall be their destroyers.

GOVERNMENT HAS THE RIGHT TO CONFER SUFFRAGE.

But some persons will say, all this is probable enough and sad enough, but what *right* have we to interfere with the States in this matter? I beg to ask such persons just this: Have not the rebels, by their rebellion, forced upon us emancipation; and have they not, therefore, forced upon us the duty of protecting those whom we emancipate from certain misery and probable destruction; and if those States have forced upon us this duty, have they not given us a perfect right to discharge this duty? This question of right disturbs some excellent persons. Let me then ask again, have not the rebels compelled us to emancipate the slaves, and thereby made it our imperative and solemn duty to provide that this emancipation shall not be dis-

astrous to them? and have they not, therefore, and necessarily, given us full and perfect right to do all that this duty requires of us? And what is this? I cannot doubt that it is to hold those States in our military possession until their constitutions provide that political right shall not depend on race or color, or until Congress shall pass an amendment to the national Constitution to the same effect. Then we may wait safely, for State after State will be sure to come up, and the work will be done.

THE TRUE THEORY OF STATE RIGHTS.

Let no man suppose that I undervalue State rights. At no moment of my life was my conviction stronger than it is now, that the whole prosperity of this country demands the preservation of the balance between the sovereignty of the nation and the rights of the States. It is because I so value these rights, that I would not permit a State which has renounced them all utterly, to resume and repossess them, until we have reasonable security that it can exercise them with safety to itself and to the whole country.

Remember that the nation must choose between two alternatives for there is no third one. Of these two, one is to give to the men who were slaves and are not now by our act—to give them by the right of suffrage, because it cannot be given them otherwise—adequate power of self-protection and defence. The other alternative is, to cast off from them the chains of slavery, and bind them anew, hand and foot, by the chains of disfranchisement; and to deliver them thus bound, helpless and hopeless, into the hands of those who were their owners, and whom we have made, in good part at least, their bitter and exasperated enemies.

The address of Mr. Parsons was listened to with close attention, and its prominent points were greeted with hearty demonstrations of assent. At its conclusion, the following resolutions were read by Edward Atkinson, Esq.:

THE RESOLUTIONS.

Resolved, That we render our devout thanks to God that He has been with us, as He was with our fathers, and that He is leading us through this second revolution to a peace which, if we are true to ourselves and to the principles of republican government, must be permanent and beneficent.

Resolved, That the work of reorganizing government and society in the rebel States requires of the legislative and executive departments of the government the most deliberate exercise of all their powers of statesmanship, and that it is far more important that the task shall be performed well than it shall be performed quickly.

Resolved, That in reorganizing the rebel States, the safety of loyal citizens in those States, the stability of our government, and the claims of justice require that none shall be allowed to vote who are not loyal, and that none shall be expelled from voting because of their race or color.

Resolved, That from the life and death of President Lincoln, we derive new motives for persevering labor to the end of securing to all the inhabitants of the land the unalienable rights proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence.

Resolved, That the life and character of President Johnson justify full confidence that he will carry out the great work for which President Lincoln laid down his life, establishing the United States of America on the broad and impregnable basis of wisdom and justice.

Resolved, That a committee of nine, consisting of Richard H. Dana, jr., Esq., Hon. Theophilus Parsons, Hon. Chas. G. Loring, Hon. John G. Whittier, Rev. Jacob M. Manning, Samuel G. Howe, Esq., George L. Stearns, Esq., John M. Forbes, Esq., and William Endicott, jr., be appointed to prepare an address to the people of the United States, urging the necessity of a reorganization of the revolted States upon just and correct principles.

Richard H. Dana, Jr., Esq., was then introduced, and on rising to address the audience was received with loud cheering. Mr. Dana spoke as follows:

SPEECH OF R. H. DANA, JR., ESQ.

Mr. President,—It was hoped by those who have summoned us together this morning, that a voice might go out from Faneuil Hall to which the people of the United could listen as in times past.

Mr. President and fellow-citizens, the questions pressing upon the people of this country are the most vast and momentous that have ever presented themselves for solution by a free people. We wish to know, I suppose, first, What are our powers. That is the first question—what are our just powers? Second—What ought we to do? Third—How ought we to do it? With your leave, I propose to attempt an answer to these questions.

What are our just powers? Well, my friends, that depends upon the answer to one question—Have we been at war, or have we not? In what have we been engaged for the last four years?—has it been a war, or has it been something else and other than war? Now, I take it upon myself to assert, and I challenge contradiction, that we have been in a condition of public and perfect war. It has been no mere suppression, by municipal powers, of an insurrection for the redress of grievances. It has been a perfect public war. The government has a right to exercise, at its discretion, every belligerent power. (Applause.) We are not bound to exercise them; the enemy cannot compel us to do it; but, at our discretion, we may exercise every belligerent power. Do you doubt it? Does any man doubt it? (Voices—"No.")

I will tell you why you must not doubt it. In the first place, the Supreme Court of the United States has, by an unanimous decision, held that we are in a public war, and that the government can exercise every belligerent power. The court differed as to the time when we entered upon such war, but that we came to it at last was their unanimous decision. The Prize Courts, like the Temple of Janus, are closed in peace, and open only in war. The Prize Courts have been thrown open, and every prize that has been condemned in this country has been condemned upon the principle of a public war. We have condemned the prizes upon the same rules, and no other, than those by which we condemned them in the war with Great Britain in 1812. This has been sustained by the Supreme Court, acted upon by the Executive, and recognized by Congress. The statutes have called it a war, in terms. The soldiers that are enlisted—what are they enlisted for? Why, they are enlisted "for the war" are they not? How is it at this moment? Is not the Executive holding those States by military occupation? Are we not holding them in the grasp of war? You cannot justify the great acts of our government for the last three years except upon the principle of the existence of war. You look in vain in the municipal rules of a constitution to find justification for what we are doing now. You might as well look into the Constitution to find rules for sinking the Alabama in the British Channel,—to find rules for taking Richmond. You might as well look there to find rules for lighting Gen. Grant's cigar. (Laughter.) No; we stand upon the ground of war, and we exercise the power of war.

Now, my fellow citizens, what are those powers and rights? What is a war? War is not an attempt to kill, to destroy; but it is *coercion for a purpose*. When a nation goes into a war, she does it to secure an end, and the war does not cease until the end is secured. A boxing match, a trial of strength or skill, are over when one party stops. A war is over, when its purpose is secured. It is a fatal mistake to hold that this war is over, because the fighting has ceased. [Applause.] This war is not over. We are in the *status* of war to-day. There is the solution of the question. Why, suppose a man has attacked your life, my friend, in the highway, at night, armed, and after a death-struggle, you get him down—what then? When he says he has done fighting, are you obliged to release him? Can you not hold him, until you have got some security against his weapons? [Applause.] Can you not hold him until you have searched him, and taken his weapons from him? Are you obliged to let him up to begin a new fight for your life? That is the principle that governs war between nations. When one nation has conquered another in a war, the victorious nation does not retreat from the country and give up possession of it, because the fighting has ceased. No; it holds the conquered enemy in the grasp of war until it has secured whatever it has a right to require. [Applause.] I put that proposition fearlessly—*The conquering party may hold the other in the grasp of war until it has secured whatever it has a right to require.*

But, what have we a right to require? We have no right to require our conquered foe to adopt all our notions, our opinions, our systems, however much we may be attached to them, however good we may think them; but we have a right to require whatever the public safety and public faith make necessary. [Applause.] That is the proposition. Then we come to this:—*We have a right to hold the other in the grasp of war until it has secured whatever it has a right to require.*

Now, my friends, I take up my new question. We have settled what our just powers are. Need I ask an audience, in Faneuil Hall, what it is that the public safety and the public faith demand? Is there a man here who doubts? In the progress of this war, we found it necessary to proclaim the emancipation of every slave. [Applause.] On the first day of January, 1863, Abraham Lincoln, of blessed memory, declared the emancipation of every slave. It was a military act, not a civil act. Military acts depend upon military power, and the measure of military power is the length of the military arm. Now, that proclamation of the first of January did not emancipate the slaves, but the military arm emancipated them, as it was stretched forth and made bare. [Applause.] District after district, region after region, State after State, have been brought within the grasp of the military arm, until at last, to-day the whole rebel territory lies within and beneath the military arm. [Loud applause.] Therefore, in State after State, region after region, the slaves have been emancipated, until at last, over the whole country, every slave is emancipated. [Renewed applause.] I would undertake to maintain before any impartial neutral tribunal in Christendom, the proposition that we have today an adequate military occupation of the whole rebel country, sufficient to effect the emancipation of every slave, by admitted laws of war. Whatever doubts may have existed as to the *manner* in which the proclamation operated, there is no doubt left now; because we have all the ground the slaves have stood upon within our military occupation.

The slaves are emancipated. In form, this is true. But the public faith stands pledged to them, that they and their posterity forever shall have a complete and perfect freedom. [Prolonged applause.] Not merely our safety; no, the public faith is pledged that every man, woman, and child of them, and their posterity forever, shall have a complete and perfect freedom. [Applause.] Do you mean to "palter with them in a double sense?" Are you willing that the great republic shall cheat these poor negroes, "keeping the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope?" Then, *how* shall we secure to them a complete and perfect freedom? The constitution of every slave State is cemented today in slavery. Their statute-books are full of slavery. It is the corner-stone of every rebel State. If you allow them to come back at once, without condition, into the exercise of all their State functions, what guaranty have you for the complete freedom of the men you have emancipated? There must, therefore, not merely be an emancipation of the actual, living slaves, but there must be an abolition of the slave system. [Applause.] Every State must have the abolition of slavery in its constitution, or else we must have the amendment of the Constitution, ratified by three-fourths of the States. Yes, that little railroad-ridden republic, New Jersey, must be shamed into adopting the amendment to the Constitution. [Applause.] New Jersey, whose vote, seventy years ago, alone prevented the adoption of Jefferson's great ordinance, making subsequently acquired territories free, and which now stands alone among the free States against this proposition of amendment—must be shamed into its adoption. [Renewed applause.] Louisiana will adopt it before her; Kentucky, perhaps, may adopt it before her. They may may come into the kingdom, when the children of the kingdom shut themselves out. [Applause.]

But, my fellow-citizens, is that enough? Is it enough that we have emancipation and abolition upon the statute books? In some states of society, I should say yes. In ancient times, when the slaves were of the same race with their masters, when the slaves were poets, orators, scholars, ministers of state, merchants, and the mothers of kings,—when they were emancipated, nature came to their aid, and they reached an equality with their masters. Their children became patricians. But, my friends, this is a slavery of race; it is a slavery which those white people have been taught, for thirty years, is a divine institution. I ask you, has the Southern heart been fired for thirty years for nothing? Have these doctrines been sown, and no fruit reaped? Have they been taught that the negro is not fit for freedom—have they believed that, and are they converted in a day? Besides all that, they look upon the negro today as the cause of their defeat and humiliation. I am afraid there is a feeling of hatred toward the negro at the South today which has never existed before. What are their laws? Why, their laws, many of them, do not allow a free negro to live in one of their States. When we emancipated the slaves, did we mean they should be banished—is that it? [Voices—"No."] Is that keeping public faith with them? And yet their laws declare so, and may declare it again.

That is not all. By their laws, a black man cannot testify in court; by their laws, he cannot hold land; by their laws he cannot vote. Now, we have got to choose between two results. With these four millions of negroes, either you must have four millions disfranchised, disarmed, untaught, landless, thriftless, non-producing, non-consuming, degraded men, or else you must have four millions of land-holding, industrious, arms-bearing and voting population. [Loud applause.] Choose between these two! Which will you have? It has got to be decided pretty soon which you will have. The corner-stone of those institutions will not be slavery, in name, but their institutions will be built upon the mud-sills of an ignorant, degraded, and oppressed negro population. Is that public safety? Is it public faith? Are those republican ideas? Some of these negroes have shed their blood for us upon the public faith. Ah! there are negro parents whose children have fallen in battle, there are children who lost fathers, and wives who lost husbands, in our cause. Our covenant with the freedmen is sealed in blood! It bears the image and superscription of the Republic! Their freedom is a tribute which we must pay, not only to Cæsar, but to God! [Applause.]

We have a right to require, my friends, that the freedmen of the South shall have the right to hold land. [Applause.] Have we not? We have a right to demand that there shall be an impartial ballot. [Great applause.] Now, my friends, let us be frank with one another. On what ground are we going to put our demand for the ballot for freedmen? Some persons may say that they will put it upon the ground that every human being has an absolute and unconditional right to vote. There never was any such doctrine! We do not mean, now, to allow about one half the South to vote. [Applause.] Why not? Why, the public safety does not admit of it. [Applause.] We put the condition of loyalty on every vote. [Applause.]

How have we done in this State? Half the people in this State are excluded from the ballot,—the better half, we are fond of calling them; no woman votes. We prescribe conditions for the men,—whatever conditions society sees fit; conditions of age; conditions of residence; conditions of tax-paying; and lately we have added, by a vast popular majority, the further high condition, that they shall have intelligence enough to read and write. (Applause.) Of course there is no such doctrine as that every human being has a right to vote. Society must settle that upon this principle—"The greatest good of the greatest number" must decide it. The greatest good of society must decide it. On what ground, then, do we put it? We put it upon the ground that the public safety and the public faith, and the rights of those freedmen, require that there shall be no distinction of color. (Applause.) That is the ground upon which it can stand. They are not safe without it in their freedom. Why, to introduce to the voting franchise four millions of slaves is a revolution. *If we do not secure that now, in the time of revolution, it can never be secured, except by a new revolution.* (Loud applause.) Do you want, some years hence, to see a new revolution? The poor, oppressed, degraded black man, bearing patiently his oppression, until he can endure it no longer, rising with arms for his rights—do you want to see that? (Voices "No.") Do you want to see them submit for ever, and *not* rise for their rights? (Voices—"No.") No, neither, you say. Well, my friends who cry "no," if either of those things happen, it is our fault. If they never get their rights, or get them by a new revolution, it will be, in either event, our fault. Do you wish to have that blame rest upon us? (Voices—"No.") No? Then "Now's the day and now's the hour." (Loud applause.) They are in a condition of transition; a condition of revolution, seize the opportunity and make it thorough! (Renewed and hearty applause.)

Fellow-citizens, a word more. This, then, is what we have a right to demand. Now comes my third question—How do you propose to accomplish it? We know our powers, we know what we want to do,—how do we propose to do it? First, the right to bear arms, fortunately, does not depend upon the decision of any State. That is a matter which, under the Constitution, depends upon the acts of Congress. Congress makes the militia, and Congress must see to it that the emancipated slaves have the privilege, the dignity, and the power of an arms-bearing population. But the right to hold lands, the right to testify in courts, the right to vote, by the Constitution, depend, not only in spirit but in the letter, upon the State constitutions. The right to vote in national elections depends on State constitutions. What are you going to do about it?

You find the answer in my first proposition. We are in a state of war. We are exercising war powers. We hold each State in the grasp of war until the State does what we have a right to require of her. [Applause.] We have a military occupation. What is the effect of that? I appeal to the most learned in the law of nations? I appeal to an authority that has spoken to you words of wisdom this morning [turning to Prof. Parsons], whether it is not a principle of war that when the conquering party has a military occupation of the country, the political relations of its citizens are suspended thereby? That is true; *suspended*, I do not say *destroyed*. Let no man say that I overlook the distinction between a civil or domestic war, and a war between recognized nations. My duties and studies and thoughts have kept my attention upon that. We have not been putting down an insurrection of professed citizens. We have fought against an empire established within the limits of this republic—a completed, *de facto* government, perfected in all its parts; and if we had not destroyed it by war, it would have remained and stood a completed government. Nothing but war has destroyed it.

Well, what did the rebel States do? It happened—it *happened*—that those people preserved their State lines—did not obliterate them; but they might have done so. It happened that they did not change their constitutions, but they might have done it. They might have resolved themselves into a consolidated republic, or a monarchy. They did as they chose. They took possession of that whole country. Why, from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, we had not even one post-office. We had not one fort; not one arsenal; not a court house, nor a custom house, nor a light-house, nor a single magistrate, nor a spot on which he could stand. They had forts, arsenals, light-houses, custom-houses, courts, the post-offices, magistrates, and were in complete possession. Under such circumstances, if the parent government is not strong enough to hold possession of the country, and a hostile, *de facto* government gets possession of it, and establishes a *de facto* government, we proportionately lose our claims to allegiance, for the time. Certainly we do—not absolutely, but for the time.

Now, what follows from all this? from a war fought over the continent and over every ocean,—their privateers vexing our commerce at the antipodes; we fighting the battles of the republic in the mouth of the British Channel [applause]; and over this whole vast republic, south of the Potomac and the Ohio,

"Every turf beneath your feet
Has been a soldier's sepulchre."

Now, if such a war leaves this people just as they were before; if no corresponding rights and powers have accrued to us, then I say, it has been the most vast and bloody and cruel nullity that the world ever saw. It is not so. We have a right now and a duty to execute those powers which belong to the condition of war. The political relations of these people to their State governments are suspended. Military occupation exists, and the republic governs them by powers derived from war. You look in vain to the Constitution to point out what shall be done. It is not unconstitutional; it is something altogether outside of it. All the powers which the President or Congress hold, or both, and are exercising, are derived from the condition of war.

I ask, again, how shall we obtain what we have a right to require? The changes we require are changes of their constitutions, are they not? The change must be fundamental. The people are remitted to their original powers. They must meet in conventions and form constitutions, and those constitutions must be satisfactory to the republic. [Loud applause.]

I desire at this point to say a word with reference to President Johnson and his course, to which I ask your special attention. When President Johnson called the people of North Carolina and one or two other States together, he did not call the blacks as well as the whites to the ballot. Now that is a question of process which requires great discretion and great wisdom. The President and his Cabinet know a great deal more about the details, and means, and probable results than we do. I believe President Johnson has the same end in view that we have here to-day. [Applause.] He has his own mode of reaching it. Some may ask, why didn't he ask the blacks to vote? I know nothing, personally, of his reasons; but I can easily see that two embarrassments might well beset him. They occur to us all at once.

The people of those States are to vote for the purpose of making their organic law. President Johnson holds them by military power. Now, is it not a very serious thing, in a republican government, to dictate from the military power the organic law for a free people? I do not ask what we have a right to do—that is not the question. The question is what ought we to do? I do not wonder that a man educated in republican principles hesitates to dictate, as military superior, who should vote in determining the organic law of a free people. He took the voters as they stood before the war; he put the test of loyalty to them; he went no further. That we may well suppose was one of his reasons.

We can easily suppose another. Take the whole black population. Shall I say to you, my friends, to-day, for the first time, that slavery is a beneficent, effective educational system? If I say it, will you believe it? Will you think me sane? Have we not all said, and thought, and fought because we believed, that slavery degraded and brutalized its victims? If a man requires us to say that the four millions of slaves have not been debased and brutalized by slavery, he requires us to unsay all we have said and believed and fought for and prayed for, the last thirty years. Slavery has degraded the negroes. It has kept them ignorant and debased. It has not, thank God, destroyed them. The germ of moral and intellectual life has survived; and we mean to see to it that they are built up into a self-governing, voting, intelligent population. [Applause.] They are not that to-day. They will become so quicker than you think. They do not need half the care nor half the patronage we used to think they did. And the ballot is a part of our educating and elevating process. But if President Johnson, on a question of means and processes, has declined to clothe them, by an exercise of military power, with the right to vote, for these reasons, then, fellow-citizens, President Johnson is entitled to your respectful consideration and to your support. [Applause.] True, he has by military power applied a test of loyalty to the voters. But that is a very mild and necessary exercise of military power. No man, I believe, questions the necessity and fitness of that act. But it is a far different thing to speak a whole nation of voters into existence—not for temporary, but for permanent and fundamental objects—by a stroke of his pen, or rather, I should say, by the uplifted sword.

One step further. Suppose the States do not do what we require—what then? I have not heard that question answered yet. Suppose President Johnson's experiment in North Carolina and Mississippi fails, and the white men, determined to keep the black men down, will not give them their rights—what then? Mr. President, I hope we shall never be called upon to answer, practically, that question. It remits us to an ultimate, and, you may say, a fearful proposition. But if we come to it, though I desire to consider myself the humblest of the persons here, I, for one, am prepared with an answer. I believe that if you come to the ultimate right of the thing, the ultimate law of the case, it is this: that this war—no, not the war, *the victory in the war*—places not the person, not the life, not the private property of the rebel—they are governed by other considerations and rules—I do not speak of them—*but the political systems of the rebel States at the discretion of the republic.* [Great applause].

You say that it is a fearful proposition. So it is; I know it is so. But is not war a fearful fact? If this is a fearful theory, is it not the legitimate fruit of a terrific fact, the war? War, my friends, is an appeal from the force of law to the law of force. I declare it a proposition that does not admit of doubt in wars between nations, that when a conqueror has obtained military possession of his enemy's country, it is in his discretion whether he shall permit the political institutions to go on, and treat with them, or whether he shall obliterate them and annex the country to his own dominions. That is the law of war between nations. Is it applicable to us? I think it is. [Applause.] I think, if you come to the ultimate right of the thing, we may, if we choose, take the position that their political institutions are at the discretion of the republic.

Why, when a man accepts a challenge to a duel, what does he put at stake? He puts his life at stake, does he not? And is it not childish after the fatal shot is fired to exclaim. "O, death, and widowhood, and orphanage are fearful things!" They were all involved in that accepted challenge. When a nation allows itself to be at war, or when a people make war, they put at stake their national existence. (Applause.) That result seldom follows, because the nation that is getting the worst of the contest makes its peace in time; because the conquering nation does not always desire to incorporate hostile subjects in his dominions; because neutral nations intervene. The conqueror must choose between the two courses—to permit the political institutions, the body politic, to go on, and treat with it, or obliterate it. Now, we mean to adhere to the first course. We mean to say the States shall remain, with new constitutions, with new systems. We do not mean to exercise sovereign civil jurisdiction over them in our Congress. Fellow-citizens, it is not merely out of tenderness to them; it would be the most dangerous possible course for us. Our system is a planetary system; each planet revolving round its orbit, and all round a common sun. This system is held together by a balance of powers—centripetal and centrifugal forces. We have established a wise balance of forces. Let not that balance be destroyed. If we should undertake to exercise sovereign civil jurisdiction over those States, it would be as great a peril to our system as it would be a hardship upon them. We must not, we will not undertake it, except as the last resort of the thinking and the good—as the ultimate final remedy, when all others have failed.

I know, fellow-citizens, it is much more popular to stir up the feelings of a public audience by violent language than it is to repress them; but on this subject we must think wisely. We have never been willing to try the experiment of a consolidated democratic republic. Our system is a system of States, with a central power, and in that is our safety. (Applause.) State rights I maintain; State sovereignty we have destroyed. (Applause.) Therefore, when I say, if we are driven to the last resort, we may embrace that; yet wisdom, humanity, common discretion, require that we should follow the course we are now following. Let the States make their own constitutions; but the constitutions must be satisfactory to the Republic (applause); and—ending as I began—by a power which I think is beyond question, the Republic holds them in the grasp of war until they have made such constitutions. (Loud applause.)

Mr. Dana was followed by Henry Ward Beecher, Senator Pomeroy, of Kansas, and George B. Loring. The resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Gov. Andrew, unable to attend, wrote the following letter:

LETTER FROM GOV. ANDREW.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, BOSTON, June 19, 1865.

My Dear Sir: I have received your note of this date, inviting me to speak at the meeting to be held at noon on Wednesday next in Faneuil Hall. That is impossible. 1. Because it is too late to prepare anything appropriate for an occasion so important, without neglecting the ordinary duties which command me, and 2. Because it is not likely I shall be able even to be present in the city at that time. Nor, while I am making ready to reach the cars, as I am at this moment, can I write more than this brief apology.

It is not my belief that in any one of the seceding States the time has yet arrived when its State government can be re-established with safety. Whether the white man only votes, or whether the colored man also votes, I regard the movement at the present moment with inexpressible concern. It has taken us four years to conquer the rebels in all of them. I would not run any risk—great or small—of allowing the same class of men to beat us by an appeal to *fraud*. They appealed to *force* and were conquered. Let us hold on to the power we now have to do right, to protect the loyal, to rebuild the State, to re-establish society, to secure the liberty of the people and the Union. Let it be used with parental kindness and in the temper of conciliation. But—*hold on to the power*, and, in the fear of God, let it be used. It was bought with the blood of more than a quarter of million of heroes and patriots who have given up their lives for their country. Let us see to it that by no error of ours such torrents of blood shall flow again. I think the loyalty of the South needs *time for concentration*. Therefore I think no reconstruction will be successful now, and therefore as a radical believer in the suffrage for all men of competent capacity, irrespective of color or national origin, I less regret that colored men are not now permitted to vote in the South. I do not believe their voting would prevent the failure which seems most likely to result from these experiments, and we may be glad not to have them involved in the catastrophe. They will vote by law. Their *votes* will be wanted, just as their *arms* were wanted. All people will yet see that, poor and ignorant as they are, they are on the right side, and that they can be neither cheated nor bullied into its betrayal or desertion. Meanwhile they will be gaining in knowledge and in admitted capacity to exercise the political functions of citizenship. All the North will by and by agree that the theoretical superiority of the white masters which did not prevent them committing the most monstrous of all the blunders and crimes of history, renders them in the eyes of practical statesmanship inferior material for good citizens to their humble and unlearned freedmen.

I deeply deplore the necessity of raising the general question of suffrage for colored men in the South thus early. I had hoped that the last vestige of heresy on that question might be first eradicated from New England, where it even now retains a foothold. I had hoped that the poor freedman might have the opportunity of a brief future, unprejudiced by becoming immediately the subject of political controversy. For one, however, I still hope and believe that there need be no strife nor angry debate. We have reached a point where temperate, philosophical, and statesmanlike treatment of grave questions has become easy, because it is of controlling and absolute necessity. We are to have an era of calm, wise, and yet brave and hopeful counsels. The people cannot afford others. They must and will resume control of public affairs—sometimes too much intrusted to accident. And then the prejudices of tradition and the caprices of politics will be alike disregarded.

Allow me to add—that in the end, although for the present it may seem otherwise to casual observation, I do not expect to find the deliberate judgment of the President, who is an able statesman and an honest patriot, differing with that of Massachusetts herself. In his reply to my own remarks, introducing to him a large delegation of gentlemen from Massachusetts, the President emphatically declared his purpose to do his utmost to make the country "permanently free." The logic of events is irresistible. Thus far freedom has been constantly gaining, and it has held whatever it gained. With patient, hopeful, and manly courage on our own part, the future is secure.

I am faithfully and respectfully yours,
JOHN A. ANDREW.

Letters cordially approving the meeting and the opinions expressed in the Resolutions were also received from Hon. A. H. Bullock, Hon. Charles G. Loring, Hon. A. H. Rice, Gen. Butler, and Hon. Sam. Hooper.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 1, 1865.

FOURTH OF JULY!

ANTI-SLAVERY CELEBRATION.

A MASS-MEETING of the friends of freedom will be held at the Grove, in Framingham, on Tuesday, July 4th, 1865. It is hoped that all the friends of a complete emancipation and of universal suffrage, for which we now plead, will endeavor to be present and testify their appreciation of the great issues impending.

The crisis, certainly, is one which calls forth the freest expression of noblest thoughts and principles.

Among the speakers expected are Rev. Merrill Richardson, Wendell Phillips, Frederick Douglass, Stephen S. Foster, Charles Lenox Remond, Abby Kelly Foster, Wm. Wells Brown, Andrew T. Foss, Mrs. F. W. Harper, Henry C. Wright, Charles C. Burleigh, and others.

Trains will be run on the Boston and Worcester Railroad and Branches as follows: Leave Boston at 9-15 and Worcester at 9-40 a.m., stopping at way stations. Also from Worcester at 9-25, express train; and Milbury regular train—Milford, 7-10 and 9-20; Northboro, 9-40; Marlboro, 7-24 and 10-08.

Fares to the Grove and back from Boston, Worcester, and Millbury, $1 for adults; 50 cents for children. From Grafton—adults, 90 cents; children, 45 cents. From Newton, the same. From Milford, by Branch, Northboro, Marlboro, Wellesley, Grantville, Cordaville, Southboro, and Westboro, 75 cents for adults, and 40 cents for children. From Natick, Holliston and Ashland, 50 cents for adults; 30 cents for children. Returning, leaves the Grove for Boston, Milford and Worcester at 5 p.m. For way stations above Framingham, except Westboro, at 5; Northboro Branch at 5.30.

Admission fee to the enclosure of the Grove, for those not coming by cars—for adults, 15 cents; children, 10 cents. Those who come by railroad admitted free. No fireworks allowed in the Grove enclosure. The house at the Grove will be open for refreshments.

☞ In case of rain the meeting will be held in Waverley Hall, opposite the Railroad Depot, South Framingham.

THE PRESIDENT TYLERIZES.

WHEN Harrison was poisoned by the agents of the Slave Power, Vice-President John Tyler became President. Elected as a Whig, he surrendered the government to the Democratic party. This treason added a new word—*Tylerize*—to our political vocabulary. Forgotten for twenty years, the conduct of President Johnson brings it again into use. His course for the last sixty days shows that he is engaged in Tylerizing, i. e. surrendering the Nation again to the control of the South, from which four years of terrible war seemed to have redeemed it.

We know that hundreds of the vigilant friends of Liberty, who confess this in private to each other, will blame us for publicly stating it. Some of them believe that he may possibly be diverted from his present purpose: others that even if this be impossible, any premature recognition and confession of his antagonism will risk the union of the Republican party. It may be so. We have, however, but one object, the Negro, and the National Union mainly as contributing to his safety and welfare. We see that the unity of the Republican party has value. Whenever keeping secrets will increase the chances of the Republican party's hanging together more than that secrecy endangers the cause of liberty itself, we will take counsel of such prudence and seal our lips. But the first rule of all warfare is not to underrate your antagonist, to divine as quickly as you can exactly where he intends to strike. We risk nothing in making the following assertions. There is a class of men scattered throughout the Nation which sees and seeks peace only in absolute and impartial justice, and will consent to no other settlement. This class is not yet sufficiently organized or its members brought into such relation with each other as to entitle it to the name of a *party*, but it is fast ripening into that. The leading minds of this class consider the whole action of the President, in the reorganization of the rebel States, as unmixedly evil. They see nothing but danger in it. *Their only hope for the Nation is in the power and purpose of Congress to checkmate the President.* We are aware, of course, of the private assurances which Mr. Johnson is said to have given to men of both sides "that he agrees with them exactly." With all that, we have nothing to do. Our only object of contemplation is the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, and we judge him by his acts. We repeat that the leading minds of that class which seeks salvation for the country in Justice have no hope but in the power and possible willingness of Congress to checkmate the President.

He has sent a distinguished North-Western politician to examine and report on the results of his plan. Some regard this as a hopeful sign. We do not. Andrew Johnson is a Southerner, and knows too well by actual experience what must inevitably be the result of such measures as he has adopted. He needs no reports for his enlightenment. If he did, the groans of victims from every Southern county are more than enough to teach him. This movement may possibly be a cover to afford him decent pretext to withdraw from the position he has assumed. If so, the pressure of public opinion which has compelled this, is the means to be used in future to keep him true to the nation's need. Meanwhile, we have a right to hold him, as every other man, responsible for the results of his actions which his intelligence could not but have foreseen.

The main reliance of the Nation's true friends is on such flagrant, gross, unblushing, and insolent misconduct from those to whom the President's plan commits the rebel States, that Congress and the Nation will be roused to see its madness and to checkmate the whole scheme. Mr. Johnson is a Southerner, and knows the perils of his plan better than we can. He is not, like Lincoln, groping his way on to find what measures may be trusted amid unusual circumstances, on which no precedent flings its light. With the last four years and his own whole life showing the madness of his course, he is deliberately trying how far on this line of peril to its safety the public will allow him to go.

In these circumstances, he is manifestly a force to be resisted, not one to be counted on our side; a power to be subdued, not one to be waited on and conciliated. This being so, our only hope of success in this struggle between Congress and the President is in a public opinion so decisive and imperious that it will compel Congress to do its bidding, spite of Executive patronage and corruption. The first duty, then, of every public teacher is to let the people know distinctly who their antagonist is and where he intends to strike. Every other policy is suicidal. It would have been far safer for Grant to have taught his army that Lee was their friend and seeking to save the Union, than for us to allow the Nation to delude itself with the dream that the President is conducting it to a real and permanent peace. We are not dealing with the honesty of his intentions. He may, possibly, imagine that the path he treads is the only legal, rightful, and patriotic one. Three quarters of the Nation believe that Lee thought the same of his path. But his blow at the Nation's life was just as harmful for all that; and so is Johnson's.

Two-thirds of the intelligent patriotism of the Nation agree that there can be no safe reorganization except it includes negro suffrage. It is said that the President admits this in private. The statesmen of the country have not asked him to reorganize *now* on this basis. They have condescended to his prejudices, and only begged that he would, for the present, hold the rebel States under military rule, thereby securing all needed industrial and financial prosperity; and meanwhile let Northern opinion mature, and give time for the South to come to a fuller sense of its needs and its weakness. Then when Congress assembles, let that rightful tribunal take the responsibility of a more definite arrangement. From a President who professes to see the great danger of any plan which omits negro suffrage, what is the reply to this advice? A comet speed in reorganizing—half a dozen States organized in about sixty days, and the negro forbidden to vote in each one! We remember the tortoise delay in Lincoln time's. Then when we pressed for more speed, we were overwhelmed with reference to the great interests involved—the need of harmonizing discordant elements—Northern purpose to be obeyed and Southern repugnance to be allowed for—the whole subject too intricate and involved for any but superficial minds to treat it quickly. When Liberty waited for aid, the word was "Order arms, stand at ease"; now, with pitfalls on every side, this policy to serve and shelter white prejudice cries, "Forward, double quick."

And how is it carried out? Almost every officer in the rebel States is a Southerner. No one of them has ever accepted any theory of justice to the negro. Most of them have openly denied his civil rights, and profess to settle the States on the basis of "the white as the *governing* race." The agents chosen to organize the revenue department in those States are, with few exceptions, old Democrats. With here and there an exception, no single element of influence in the rebel States is placed in the hands of men with Northern ideas. All is substantially under the control of the unchanged aristocratic, Union-and-negro-hating elements of the South. Ballot-box, jury-box, state-house, police, custom-house, internal revenue, all these things which impress character on the politics of a State, are in the hands of Southerners of whose Unionism it would be a compliment to say it was matter of question, or of Northerners who were Copperheads as long as they dared to be. The exceptions to this are too few to need mention, and the action of these few is too often checked by superiors of Southern bias.

If it were necessary thus hurriedly to press reorganization, in present circumstances, no man should have held office or had influence in any rebel State who had not *proved* his loyalty to Northern ideas as thoroughly as Lovejoy did, as Julian, Kelley, Stevens, Wade, and Sumner have. Yet the N. Y. *Times* after confessing that it was "difficult for any Southerner to escape a close connection of some kind with the movement of the State in which he lived," goes on to add that in conferring offices of power and trust in rebel States, "we must cease to inquire *mainly* what men have been, and find out what they are now and will be hereafter, if we would judge of their fitness to take part in public affairs."

Men say "the President may be trusted—he has fought all his life with the Southern Aristocracy." We have all been accustomed to say this. But it must be true only in a very qualified sense, of a man who has held all the offices that Tennessee, ruled by the Southern white Aristocracy, could bestow. And if it were more fully true, it is no safe reliance. Democrats in office have two paths before them; one is, fight still your old foe. The other is, win admission to Conservative ranks by bartering something of your principle. The First Napoleon, a democrat lifted to a throne, bought the tinsel varnish of royal recognition by a shameful divorce and a marriage of convenience. This present Napoleon stood a beggar at the door of every Court which had marriageable daughters, with the same purpose, and only accepted his fate, to wed beneath the throne, when every Royal door had been shut in his face. Every day shows us American Democrats and Radicals acting the same sad part: eating their own words to win a smile from moneyed or social aristocracy. The President is buying his way into Southern white favor, by sacrificing the negro's rights and the nation's safety to the old Southern dream of a skin aristocracy.

His friends urge that he believes the States still to exist, and that in reorganization he has no right to interfere with such matters as suffrage, over which the States have always held exclusive control. Have not the States always chosen their own Governors? Why then does he send them Governors? Have the States always regulated the suffrage? Why then does he interfere in it, so far as to exclude from the ballot-box every white voter who will not take the oath he prescribes?

Manifestly, he sends Governors into the States instead of allowing them to choose their own, and he excludes disloyal white men from the polls, because of the necessity of the case; which necessity clothes him with the full *war power* over their affairs. They have made war and been beaten, and must abide the will of the conqueror; who has the right to change their political systems as far as his safety requires.

Now this same necessity which justifies him in disfranchising a disloyal white man, justifies him also in enfranchising the loyal black man. To contend that there's any legal difficulty in the way, is a pretense too flimsy to conceal the ugly reality, which is the President's unwillingness that wholesome delay should result in a public opinion, able to awe Congress into Negro Suffrage. He hurries six or ten reorganized States up to the doors of Congress—States, the creatures and minions of this skin Aristocracy; and then his partisans will, if necessary, piteously argue to Congress: "Why, here these stand—remember how much labor has been expended on them—do not let it all be waste—how offensive such a rebuff would be to the loyal South—better admit them, as we've gone so far—as Lincoln said, 'hatch the egg, now you have it;" etc., etc. And they will succeed—unless infinite effort is made to prevent.

Meanwhile when we point out this danger and urge remonstrance, self-constituted watchmen on the towers cry, "Don't hint any disagreement with the Administration"—"the business is not ripe for action"—"don't hasten matters"—"don't move till the question is fully ripe." Yes—the enemy is sowing tares, and we are counselled, having first opened our eyes wide and seen it, to go deliberately to sleep till the tares are fully grown! This has been the usual policy of the Republican party. This fastened a Southerner on us for President to-day. But for it we should have had HAMLIN and been safe. This keeps half or wholly shut, in Johnson's presence, the lips of those of the Cabinet who agree with us as to the peril of the hour. We chose a Southerner, and now counsel and practice silence before him, while he plans to bring back the South to rule. The policy of waiting to oppose him till he has fortified himself, is McClellan's policy before Richmond, and invites defeat. Our policy should be Grant's, and announced in his words, "We propose immediately to move on your works."

ONE MORE "PROVISIONAL."—It is asserted that Mr. Augustine L. Taveau—he on whose letter to the *Tribune* we lately commented—is to be appointed Provisional Governor of South Carolina. A correspondent of the *Cincinnati Gazette* says of him:

"He is a young man, was with Soulé in Spain, on Beauregard's staff in Charleston, a Captain in the rebel service, but as he says, always a Union man. It is said to be decided that he is to be the man in South Carolina. President Johnson was requested to appoint a Northern man for South Carolina, but he replied, in that doggedly positive tone of his, that he would not do it—that he would appoint no Northern man to any Southern State."

Very well, we promise not to complain if he will appoint a *Southern* man—whose pledge of loyalty shall be his black skin! But the kind of Union men that serve on Beauregard's staff are preferred by the President to those who fought under the stars and stripes.

THE BOSTON MEETING.

WE make room in our already crowded columns for a very full report of the Reorganization Meeting last week in Faneuil Hall; for the meeting is important by the character of those who composed it and who addressed it, by the resolutions, by the great ability of the speeches, and by its unequivocal declaration for negro suffrage as the essential condition of successfully reorganizing the States. Add to that, the meeting has attracted the widest attention throughout the country, and general comment from the Press. Yet we have not seen its true character adequately stated. New York papers talk of it as a meeting of the Boston Radicals. One journal that a month ago advocated precisely the doctrine now uttered in Boston, urges the President to send the speakers and their hearers to Fort Lafayette. If he does, he will have to take the cream of Boston conservatism. For it is State Street as well as the State House that to-day in Faneuil Hall demands the ballot for the black; and Harvard College and Beacon Street, the learning, the wealth, and the exclusiveness of Boston thare on the side of justice and equal rights.

Theophilus Parsons, who presided, is a Cambridge Law-Professor, cautious as he is able. Among the Vice-Presidents are not a few of the "solid men of Boston"—men of granite—some of whom are Republicans indeed, but not one of whom ever deemed himself a Radical. Richard H. Dana, Jr., who made the leading speech is about the most conservative man in the Republican party His speech is enough to show how widely he differs from the Radicals of that party. He is not a Democrat in any sense of the word—does not believe in the people, nor in universal suffrage. He is, moreover, U. S. District-Attorney, and seems not unwilling to find excuses for the President, and to hope he will do better. But read his speech, and see how little in the light of that clear and masterly argument, the apology at the end amounts to. Officeholder and aristocrat as he is, he is too honest and too intelligent to go wrong now on the momentous question of the hour. There is much in his speech from which we dissent, but we heartily commend it for perusal and reflection.

Such voices as these the Administration cannot but hear and heed. Well for the President and for the country if they are heeded in season. That they may the more surely be, such meetings ought to be held all over the North; for the opinion of the North is on the side of the negro, and needs only to be expressed to become irresistible.

GEN. TERRY'S ORDER.

WITH a sweep of his pen—or, as Mr. Dana says, with his uplifted sword—Gen. Terry has abolished the slave code of Virginia! The document will take its place beside the proclamations of Fremont and Hunter:

"GENERAL ORDERS—NO. 77.
"HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA,
"RICHMOND, VA., June 23, 1865.

"The laws of the State of Virginia, and the ordinances of the different municipalities within the State, having especial reference to, and made to restrain the personal liberty of, free colored persons, were designed for the government of such persons while living amid a population of colored slaves; they were enacted in the interest of slaveowners, and were designed for the security of slave property; they were substantially parts of the slave code.

"Slavery has been abolished in Virginia, and therefore, upon the principle that where the reason of the law ceases the law itself ceases, these laws and ordinances have become obsolete. People of color will henceforth enjoy the same personal liberty that other citizens and inhabitants enjoy; they will be subject to the same restraints, and to the same punishments, for crime, that are imposed on whites, and to no others.

"Vagrancy, however, will not be permitted; neither whites nor blacks can be allowed to abandon their proper occupations, to desert their families, or roam in idleness about this department; but neither whites nor blacks will be restrained from seeking employment elsewhere, when they cannot obtain it with just compensation at their homes, nor from travelling from place to place on proper or legitimate business.

"Until the civil tribunals are re-established, the administration of criminal justice must, of necessity, be by military courts; before such courts the evidence of colored persons will be received in all cases.

"By command of Maj.-General A. H. TERRY.
"ED. W. SMITH, Asst. Adj.-General."

Considering the attitude of the Administration, that is a bold step for Gen. Terry to take. Will he be sustained in it? It is more than mere emancipation. It lifts the negro at once to equality, in almost every respect, with the whites. The odious laws that discriminated between them disappear, and the ballot alone is wanting to affirm and secure the protection which this order confers temporarily on the colored race. That, of course, Gen. Terry could not venture to give, in opposition to the declared policy of the President; yet he has given and done enough to show that the power which Andrew Johnson refused to use, he did, in fact, possess. In Virginia, which has a Governor and Legislature of its own, a military commander can lay his hand on the statute-book itself, and declare, by virtue of his military authority, that laws are abolished. How can the President then justify his refusal, in States that have no Governors, no Legislatures, and no laws, to exercise that same military authority for the benefit of the people of the country? Can a General who derives all his power from that President do more than the President? Yet we have some hope that the President will not annul the beneficent act of his General.

Thanks also to Gen. Hartsuff for his order, elsewhere printed, which scatters the conspiracy of Virginia planters to rob the negroes of five dollars a month. There is hope for the negro if such men are to retain command.

HALTING OHIO.

THE Ohio Republican State Convention offers an illustration of the demoralizing influence which the President exercises over the Republican party. Nobody doubts that Ohio is heartily for Freedom and Universal Suffrage, yet her Convention is so adroitly manipulated as to seem to declare otherwise. There was a hot fight in the Resolution Committee, but the non-committal men carried the day. The second resolution "cheerfully indorses the policy of the administration" and pledges to the President "hearty and undivided support." Yet to avoid wholly alienating the Radical vote this resolution was also passed:

"That while we are anxious for an early reconstruction of fraternal relations with the insurgent States, we demand that such reconstruction shall be at such time and upon such terms as will give unquestioned assurance of the peace and security, not only of the loyal people of the rebel States, but also of the peace and prosperity of the Federal Union."

But when Don Piatt undertook to get before the Convention resolutions squarely approving Negro Suffrage, he was silenced. The *Cincinnati Gazette*, radical, says of the day's work, with undisguised dislike and contempt:

"The resolutions are general in their character, and were evidently shaped to secure harmony, while they also show some of the features of mosaic work. This must inevitably be the nature of resolutions at a State Convention, where there is no time for deliberation, and where debate is necessarily cut off by the necessity of getting through the whole business in one short session. They bless the departed and the incoming President, indorse his reconstruction measures, exhort him not to hurry the matter, and declare that the principles of the Declaration of Independence should govern. They declare abiding faith in the drift of events."

The *Commercial*, an administration journal, is even more frank in its confessions:

"*Of course we do not pretend that there was not a disposition shown to evade the rugged issues.* All parties, with the responsibilities and emoluments of power, are careful of the phraseology of their platforms, and commit themselves as little as possible to rigorous doctrine.

"*A debate in open convention of the question of negro suffrage would have resulted in an explosion.* Hence the adoption of the rule referring all resolutions to the Committee on Resolutions, without reading and without debate. *This is the old Democratic gag*, found necessary by that party when it had power and was responsible for things."

And there is much more of the same sort. The Cleveland *Leader*, the Radical Western-Reserve organ, denounces the trickery of the Convention:

"The platform is remarkable rather for what it omits to say than for what it says. *It weakly and timidly ignores the only vital issue of the day—the great question of negro suffrage.* Beside this, there is no other live issue on which parties are divided. *In dodging this, the Convention has proved itself two years behind the times, and has inflicted a bitter disappointment upon all earnest and thinking Unionists.*"

A disappointment which may possibly show itself at the polls. It is said, however, that Gen. Cox, the nominee for Governor, is a personal and political friend of

Chief-Justice Chase, and right on the suffrage question, and that the Convention only played the old political game of giving the platform to one party and the candidate to the other. But how long will the Republican party—a loose organization at best—stand the strain of such conflicts as inevitably result from an attempt to indorse its own President in the leading measure of his administration?

THE FREEDMEN'S BUREAU.

Has this Bureau a system? If it has, is the circular of Mr. J. E. Bryant, Superintendent of Freedmen for Georgia, to be taken as a sample of what is to be enforced upon the other States of which the Bureau has charge? Of Mr. Bryant we know nothing except from his published circular, and, judging from that, we should like to know as little as possible of him in the future. He seems to consider it his duty to establish a schedule of wages for the freedmen under his charge—a reminiscence of the infamous Louisiana system which Gen. Banks created. And this is Mr. Bryant's tariff:

FIELD HANDS.	Per Month.
Male hands	$7 00
Half hands	3 50
Female hands	6 00
Half hands	3 00
HOUSE SERVANTS.	
Male servants, first class	10 00
Male servants, second class	8 00
Male servants, third class	6 00
Female servants, first class	8 00
Female servants, second class	6 00
Female servants, third class	5 00

We should be glad if somebody would explain to us the proper duty of the Freedmen's Bureau and its superintendents. Where does it get a right to regulate the price of labor for a State? Where does it get a right to fix it at this scandalous rate? Was the Bureau meant for the protection of the planter? The schedule above quoted is very little better than that which the planters of a dozen Virginia counties lately conspired together to impose on the negroes, and for ought that yet appears under Gen. Howard's administration, the negroes would do better to trust to their own protection than to his. As against the planter, they have at least the right to refuse to work on extortionate terms, but how will they hold out when the Government becomes a party to the fraud, and under pretence of befriending the blacks, fixes a rate of wages that is little short of stealing?

Nor is the inadequacy of the amount the worst feature in this scheme. The Superintendents of Gen. Howard have no business to be fixing *any* rate of wages. Are not the blacks free? Can they not make their own contracts? The planters need and must have their labor, and eventually must pay a decent price for it, if the blacks are left to deal with them on equal terms. But Mr. Bryant intervenes with his schedule, and if military authority is to back him, will prove competent, as he is willing, to deprive the freedmen of their chance of just wages. Even Banks did not venture to put his price below eight dollars a month. The Freedmen's Bureau seems to be going behind the intelligence of the Louisiana régime of two years ago. Be it lack of capacity or lack of intention—we know not which; but this we know, that under its present administration the Bureau is proving itself no friend to the Emancipated negro, and unless it is speedily and radically reformed will prove a disgrace to the country.

THE "RESTORATION" OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

Of the South Carolina delegation now in Washington urging their reconstruction views on Mr. Johnson, a despatch to the Boston *Journal* remarks:

"They very modestly ask that the government shall redeem the Confederate Bonds proper, which amount according to their calculation to about two hundred million (200,000,000) dollars.

"The delegation represent over one million of the worthless trash—hence their anxiety on the subject."

If these men have the assurance to proffer such a request at this moment, what will South Carolina—and with her the rest of the South—not ask when once admitted on the floor of Congress on a white suffrage basis of reconstruction?

Their character is further depicted by the Washington correspondent of the *Herald*—who would be likely to tell the best story he could in their favor. But his testimony is:

"The delegation here do not all represent the Unionists of the State, the few there are to represent. One, who aims to be the giver of advice to President Johnson, has declared in Charleston that he 'wished the Yankees had but one throat that he might cut it.' Another declared that he 'would burn his house rather than that a damned Yankee should pollute it with his presence;' and so on through the entire list.

"Dr. A. G. Mackey, the newly appointed Collector at Charleston, has returned to the city after his visit to West Point, and is showing up this pseudo South Carolina delegation in vivid colors. He charges that the men composing the delegation now here were original secessionists. They admit it to be true, and attempt no concealment. Colonel Yates, of the delegation, entered Fort Sumter immediately after its evacuation by Major Anderson, and remained in the rebel military service until the surrender of Joe' Johnston. Others of the delegation voted and acted as consistent secessionists throughout."

And these are the men to whom President Johnson proposes to entrust the fortunes of a State rich in four hundred thousand citizens whose fidelity to the Union is beyond suspicion! And he proposes to put the welfare of a devotedly loyal race into the hands of the men who became traitors in order that they might keep that race in slavery. They failed in that, but they will probably succeed in getting from the President a new lease of power over their former victims, and by his help will reëstablish, if not slavery, many of its worst features.

The Editor of the *Advocate and Journal* sends us a note to say that the language quoted from that paper last week, in favor of welcoming back the Southern Methodist churches, was the language of a correspondent, and not of the Editor. We gladly make the correction, and that we may do full justice to the *Advocate and Journal*, we quote the following from its Editor's letter:

"The position of this paper since it came into my hands, more than a year ago, has been as decidedly progressive on the negro question as your own. On the particular subject of negro suffrage, it was among the very first to declare in its favor. As to the point referred to in the extract you make, and charge it to the paper as its position, never have the Editorial utterances of the paper contained one word for it, but many earnest ones against it."

Iowa.—The Republicans of this freedom-loving young State declared, in their recent State Convention, that they believe in negro suffrage, North as well as South. They resolved:

"That with proper safe-guards to the purity of the ballot-box, the elective franchise should be based upon loyalty to the Constitution and Union, recognizing and affirming the equality of all men before the law; therefore, we are in favor of amending the Constitution of our State by striking out the word "white" in the article on suffrage."

The Colored People of Worcester, in their celebration of Fast-day, adopted the following sensible resolution:

"That, while bringing our tribute of affection to-day to the memory of the man whom God has made the mighty means of our deliverance, we should be untrue to our race and our country, if we let this occasion pass without affirming our deep conviction that neither IS THE NATION SAVED NOR ARE WE DELIVERED, unless the right of suffrage be secured to the entire body of loyal freedmen in all the States, lately in rebellion; and we justly demand, both on the score of right and of the unflinching loyalty of our race, through all the arduous war, and as the easiest and surest method of national pacification, that the fundamental principle of reconstruction now be, NO DIFFERENCE IN PRIVILEGE BETWEEN THE NATION'S WHITE MEN AND THE NATION'S BLACK MEN, BUT ALL EQUAL BEFORE THE LAW."

FREE SPEECH IN CONCORD, N. H.

To the Editor of the Standard:

Rev. Mr. Hatch, the minister of the Unitarian Society, in Concord, delivered a discourse on Emancipation, on the first Sunday in the month, in which he earnestly advocated the right of the negro to the elective franchise. This being against the repeatedly expressed desire of several wealthy and influential members of the society occasioned great excitement.

One very prominent man lost all control of himself, and shook his fist in Mr. Hatch's face, as he passed through the entry on his way out of the house, called him a "miserable puppy," and declared that if he was allowed to preach there another Sunday, he would never set his foot in the house again. Getting some others to join him, an informal meeting of the society was called, and a vote taken to close the house until further notice. Whereupon the minister and his friends held a service in Eagle Hall, where the objectionable discourse was repeated to a very large congregation.

A legal meeting of the society is called for the 24th inst., when it is hoped and believed that the vote will be to re-open the house.

At a meeting of the church members, last Sunday, p. m., the following was adopted unanimously.

Resolved, "That this church feels aggrieved at the action of the society, at its recent informal meeting, in voting to close the meeting-house against the minister and those who desire to sit under his ministrations; and they hereby express the hope that the society, at the legal meeting soon to be held, will vote in favor of re-opening it."

C. D. W.

The report of the Waterloo meeting—twice crowded out—shall appear next week.

PERSONAL.

Miss Anna Dickinson is visiting Richmond, and is expected to speak there.

Charles A Page, the well-known army correspondent of the New-York *Tribune*, has received the appointment of Consul at Zurich, Switzerland. He will leave in August with ex-Assistant Secretary Harrington, the new Minister to Switzerland.

Lord Palmerston has offered Mrs. Cobden a pension of £1,500 per annum, which she has declined, at the same time expressing her grateful sense at the kindness manifested by the crown and the administration.

Richard Yeadon, the South Carolinian, who offered a reward of $10,000 for Butler's head, is living in abject poverty at Aiken. He has taken the oath of allegiance.

Over the door of a small saddlery in Galena, Illinois, still hangs the sign "Grant and Son." The senior member of the firm is now living in Covington, Kentucky, and the junior member, now busy on national affairs in Washington, will visit him there next month.

The Albany *Journal* says; "Gen. Grant is far from well. The herculean labors of the past eighteen months have made serious inroads even upon his iron constitution. He is troubled with night sweats, and complains of prostration. He goes to Saratoga in a few days to recruit."

Jenny Lind Goldschmidt sang recently at a concert in London, to introduce to the public Herr Labor, a blind pianist. It is said that she never sang with more genuine inspiration and fervor. Herr Labor is pianist to the blind King of Hanover.

Incidentally, Gen. Hooker tells how Stonewall Jackson was killed:

Q. You say Jackson was killed on the 2d of May by his own troops?

A. Yes, sir. He was riding along the road, and one of the pickets shot him.

By Mr. Gooch:

Q. Accidentally?

A. Yes, sir. His staff was with him, and their pickets mistook them to be a part of our cavalry.

Hon. Daniel S. Dickinson, of New York, in an interview with President Johnson, on the subject of extending the right of suffrage to the blacks, assured him that in doing so he would be sustained by an overwhelming majority in all the Northern States.

At the Chicago fair, after Gen. Grant had repeatedly declined to speak, Gen Sherman was called upon; but he told the audience in joke that he would not address them unless ordered to do so by his superior officer. Gen. Grant briskly responded that "he never ordered a soldier to do any thing he did not want to do or could not do himself."

President Johnson, says a correspondent, in an interview with the delegation of Quakers, who asked that he might give his influence for universal suffrage, informed them that he was fully acquainted with the negro race in the South, and that he believed that the question was one surrounded with very grave difficulties. He intimated clearly that he was not in favor of negro suffrage, for the present at least.

We are glad to learn, says the Boston *Journal*—and we are glad the *Journal* is glad—that one of the first acts of Gen. Terry, after taking command of the Department of Virginia, was to remove Mayor Mayo from the position in which he had been reinstated by Gen. Halleck. No one who ever saw Mayo, or who knows anything of his habits and character, can question his utter unfitness for the place. He might do for Mayor of Richmond when the slave code was in force, and he would be a very fit man to enforce it rigidly. But with Richmond a free city, he is entirely out of place in that or any office.

Mr. Gladstone has been making a speech in favor of his son's election to Parliament from Chester, in the course of which he remarked that he had advised his son to adopt the Liberal side, and that not stingily but heartily; understanding by Liberal principles "*the principle of trust in the people only relieved by prudence; by the principles of their opponent, mistrust in the people only relieved by fear*,"—a happy epigram which will be repeated.

Of Mrs. Frances Seward, wife of William H. Seward, who died last Thursday, June 22, a correspondent writes us:

"She was a true and devoted friend to the unfortunate of every class—especially to the colored race. In the memorable case of Freeman, the negro, whom a mob of religious and respectable people of Auburn tried to lynch, she was the chief support of her husband in his heroic defence of the demented maniac. And so through the life of Mr. Seward, in all the great services he has rendered to the cause of Freedom, she was truly, as the writer in the *Times* says, his 'counsellor.' I may add, further, that her sympathies were ever with the most zealous Abolitionists, and for many years she was a constant reader of your paper."

The Asia brought news of the death of Sir Joseph Paxton, the architect and horticulturist. He first became famous as an architect by reason of his success as Superintendent of the Duke of Devonshire's works at Chatsworth—works which were held to render that nobleman's country seat at that place the finest in England. In 1851 he was the designer of the Crystal Palace for the World's Exhibition, and the edifice was built under his superintendence. For his services in that instance, he was knighted. He constructed the enlarged and remodelled Sydenham Crystal Palace, having charge of the laying out of the grounds as well. Sir Joseph Paxton was twice or three times elected to the House of Commons. He was author of, or contributor to, a number of horticultural publications. At the time of his death he was sixty-two years of age.

Letter from Mazzini.—Joseph Mazzini, the Italian agitator, has addressed a letter to Mr. Fisher, the London Agent of the Sanitary Commission, in which he says:

"Your triumph is our triumph; the triumph of all, I hope, who are struggling for the advent of a republican era. Our adversaries were pointing to the worst period of the old French revolution as to the irrefutable proof of republics leading to terror, anarchy, and military despotism. You have refuted all that. You have done more for us in four years than fifty years of teaching, preaching and writing from all your European brothers have been able to do."

He then goes on to remark that, having established the republican principle on which our government is founded, we are called upon to enter on a new career as a leading power in Europe. He concludes as follows:

"Above American life, above European life, there is mankind's life, mankind's education, mankind's progress. That is the common aim in which we are all brothers and combatants. There is our great battle—to which all local battles are episodes—fought on both continents and everywhere, between liberty and tyranny, equality and privilege, right and might, justice and arbitrary rule, good and evil, God and the devil. By these four years of noble deeds and self-sacrifice, you have been enlisted to take a share in it wherever it is fought.

"Remember this. Remember us, who are ready to help in the task. And remember the plan in which the first line has been visibly written by European despotism in Mexico."

Rear Admiral Du Pont died last Friday, June 23, in Philadelphia. He claims from us a grateful remembrance as a consistent and active friend to the blacks all through the war. The *Tribune* truly says of him:

"Nor let it be forgotten that even in that early stage of the war when it was neither politic nor fashionable to care for the negro, Du Pont signalized his naval administration at Port Royal by a never-failing recognition of the rights of the blacks to protection. When it was reported to him that one or two cases had occurred of slight injury to a few negroes from boats' crews of his squadron, he issued and enforced stringent orders against the landing of any boat from the fleet without the written permit of his Fleet Captain. And from that time on, he was distinguished for many acts of personal and official kindness, as well as justice, to the blacks with whom he in any way came in contact. Educated and living in a Slave State, he nevertheless believed in Justice and Humanity."

We add that to our knowledge Admiral Du Pont heartily co-operated with all the efforts made at Port Royal in behalf of the blacks. He was—as we have heard him say—one of the early converts of the war to anti-slavery measures, and he everywhere lent the weight of his great reputation and influence to the policy of Emancipation.

We need not recount the facts of his professional career. His victory at Port Royal was the first great success of the war, and the fruits of it were perennial. His attack on Charleston did not succeed simply because he was ordered to attempt an impossibility—as he well knew, and as has since been abundantly demonstrated and conceded. None the less did he gallantly and skillfully do his duty. The corrupt complicity of the iron-clad contractors with the actual head of the Navy Department, subsequently secured his removal, but no official injustice was able to tarnish the fame of the most brilliant officer in the American navy.

LITERARY.

The Atlantic Monthly for July—Ticknor & Fields, Boston—has variety enough, but not a great deal that can be called first class magazine writing. "Young Men in History," by E. P. Whipple, is an old lecture newly printed. "Around Mull," by Maria S. Cummins, threatens a continuation, which, let us hope, will be livelier than the beginning. "The Changeling" is Whittier's, but has not the best part of *our* Whittier in it. Except the continuation of "Dr. Johns," the reader may safely skip the succeeding articles till he comes to "Assassination," by Hazewell, which he will value for the facts, though he may not relish Mr. Hazewell's newspaper style in what ought to be the polished pages of the Atlantic. Mrs. Stowe's "Chimney Corner" makes the seventh of a homely and often suggestive series of papers—this quite as good as any. Much the most noticeable contribution to the present number is "The Chicago Conspiracy," by Edmund Kirke, written with the glittering point of a pen used to mingle fiction with history, yet in this case, we think, meaning to tell a sober tale of actual fact. There is nothing in the story itself incredible after the hotel burning plot in New York, the Blackburn yellow fever conspiracy, the murder of prisoners by starving, and the other perfectly authenticated atrocities of the rebellion. The book notices are crisp, and not so indiscriminately laudatory as the Atlantic has at times unhappily been.

Our Young Folks, from the same publishers, for July, is an entertaining number, and contains "Freddy's New Year's Dinner," by L. Maria Child; "The Model Young Lady," by Marian Douglas; "The Fish I Didn't Catch," by John G. Whittier; "How Our Great Grandfather was Killed," by P. H. B.; "A Complaint," by Mrs. Anna M. Wells; "Lessons in Magic," by P. H. C.; "Farming for Boys," by the Author of Ten Acres Enough; "Our Dogs," V., by Mrs. Stowe; "The Little Prisoner," IV., by Edmund Kirke; "Winning his Way," by Carleton; (the last two, admirable stories of the war) "Afloat in the Forest," by Mayne Reid; "The Right Work," by Tacie Townsend; and "Round the Evening Lamp." Illustrations, some of them good, abound in this neatly printed magazine, and it is, spite of some manifest defects, the best boys and girls magazine we have.

Demorest's Illustrated Monthly and Mirror of Fashion.—The July No. is on our table. In the Department of Fashion the Mirror holds a high place. Among its literary contents, "A National Jubilee Song," by Carlos Wilcox, and "To the Hudson River," by Rev. Dr. Cheever, illustrated with sketches of the scenery, are excellent, and there is an abundance of other reading matter.

The Phrenological Journal.—The double No. for July contains portraits, character, and biography of President Johnson; something about Julius Cæsar, whom the Emperor Napoleon's book has invested with a modern interest; a dissertation on Corpulence and Leanness, with an account of the famous Banting system; a portrait and sketch of Secretary Harlan; a personal description of the conspirators on trial at Washington; portraits also and biographies of the Queen of England and the Empress of the French,—and, in a word, a great variety of amusing and instructive matter. The Journal is popular, widely circulated, and widely read, and never fails to keep up with the interest of the times.

The Civil-List Pensions in Great Britian, for 1864-5 are announced. Amongst the rewards for literary and artistic services may be mentioned a pension of £100 a year to Mrs. Leech, widow of Mr. John Leech; £100 to Mrs. Boole, widow of the late Professor of Mathematics in Queen's College, Cork, in consideration of his "attainments as an original mathematician of the highest order, and of his remarkable labors toward the extension of the boundaries of science;" £140 to Mr. William Howitt, in consideration of "the long and useful career of literary labor in which both he and his wife have been engaged;" and £65 to Mr. Thomas Wright, the well-known author of many valuable works relating to English literary and political history.

A "Mohammedan Commentary on the Holy Bible," by Syud Ahmud, is being published in India. The Syud has spent much time on the work, the first eleven chapters of the Bible having alone called for a commentary occupying 368 quarto pages in parallel columns of Hindustani and English. The old Ptolemaic notions of crystalline spheres, and the belief that the earth is stationary, which the Mohammedans have adhered to so long, are treated in this commentary as fables. The "firmament" he regards as the heavenly expanse; and that the sun is the centre of the system he has no doubt. The Pentateuch, as we have it is identical, he says, "with that of Moses."

The proceedings in connection with the anniversary festival of the Newspaper Press Fund in London, have resulted in the addition of £1,200. to its treasury. The dinner was well attended, and as Mr. Charles Dickens was in the chair, it is needless to say that good speeches were delivered. The humor and tact of Mr. Dickens were never more strikingly displayed at a public dinner than on Saturday evening, while the generous and genial way in which he identified himself with the class whose cause he was advocating excited more enthusiasm and admiration than even his wit. The *Times* was not represented at the festival, and has ignored it since.

Mr. Disraeli's new Conservative manifesto is as badly written as the average Royal Speech. "The impending appeal to the country," he says, "involves consequences as momentous as any recurrence to its sense by the Crown has perhaps hitherto offered." The conservatives "have defeated the measures to carry which the present Ministry was formed, and in the course of the struggle they have educated the public mind to bring to the final solution a decision more matured and enlightened." But worse remains, viz., a passage in which we are told: "who may be the Ministers of the Queen, *are* the accidents of history; what will remain on that enduring page is the policy pursued and its consequences on her realm." This beats the penny-a-liners, English or American.

LAST WORDS FROM THE PRESIDENT ON RECONSTRUCTION.

Washington, Saturday, June 24, 1865.

A delegation from South Carolina, consisting of the following named persons, had, late this afternoon, an interview by appointment with the President; Judge Frost, Isaac E. Holmes, George W. Williams, W. H. Gillett, J. A. Sternmeyer, Frederick Richards, William Winley, James H. Taylor, R. H. Gill, and Joseph A. Yates.

The President said it was his intention to talk plainly, so that there might be no misunderstanding. Therefore, it were better they should look each other full in the face and not imitate the ancient augurs who, when they met one another, could smile at their success in deceiving the people. He said that if this Union was to be preserved, it must be on the principle of fraternity, both the Northern and Southern States maintaining certain relations to the government. A State cannot go out of the Union, and, therefore, none of them having gone out, we must deal with the question of restoration, and not reconstruction. He suspected that he was a better States' Rights man than some of those now present.

Mr. Holmes—You always so claimed to be. (Laughter.)

The President replied that he always thought that slavery could not be sustained outside of the Constitution of the United States, and that when the experiment was made it would be lost. Whether it could or could not, he was for the Union, and if slavery set itself up to control the government, the government must triumph and slavery perish. The institution of slavery made the issue, and we might as well meet it like wise and patriotic and honest men. All institutions must be submitted to the government, and slavery has given way. He could not if he would remand it to its former status. He knew that some whom he now addressed looked upon him as a great people's man and a radical. But however unpleasant it might be to them, he had no hesitation in saying that before and after he entered public life he was opposed to monopolies and perpetuities and entails. For this he used to be denounced as a demagogue. We had a monopoly South in slaves. Though he had bought and held slaves, he had never sold one. From Magna Charta we had derived our ideas of freedom of speech, liberty of the press, and unreasonable searches, and that private property should not be taken for public uses without just compensation. He had these notions fixed in his mind, and was therefore opposed to class legislation. Being providentially brought to his present condition, he intended to exert the power and influence of the government so as to place in power the population of this nation. He proceeded on the principle that the great masses are not the mushrooms about a stump which wet weather supplies. He believed that this nation was sent on a great mission to afford an example of freedom and substantial happiness to all the powers of the earth. The Constitution of the United States, in speaking of persons to be chosen as Representatives in Congress, says that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature. Here we find a resting place. This was the point at which the rebellion commenced—all the States were in the Union moving in harmony—but a portion of these rebelled, and, to some extent, suspended and paralyzed the operations of their governments. There is a constitutional obligation resting upon the United States government to put down rebellion, suppress insurrection, and to repel invasion. The slaves went into the war as slaves, and came out free men of color. The friction of the rebellion has rubbed out the nature and character of slavery. The loyal men who were compelled to bow and submit to the Rebellion should, now that the Rebellion is ended, stand equal to loyal men everywhere. Hence the wish of restoration, and the trying to get back the States to the point at which they formerly moved in perfect harmony. He did not intend to serve any particular clique or interest. He would say to the delegation that slavery was gone as an institution. There was no hope that the people of South Carolina could be admitted into the Senate or the House of Representatives until they had afforded evidence by their conduct of this truth. The policy, now that the Rebellion is suppressed, is not to restore the State government through military rule, but by the people. While the war has emancipated slaves, it has emancipated a larger number of white men. He would talk plain, as the delegation had said that was what they desired. He would go to men who had owned 50 or 100 slaves, and who did not care as much for the poor white man as they did for the negro. Those who own the land have the capital to employ help, and therefore some of our Northern friends are deceived when they, living afar off, think they can exercise a greater control over the freedmen than the Southern men who have been reared where the institution of slavery has prevailed.

Now he did not want the late slaveholders to control the negro voters against white men. Let each State judge of the depositary of its own political power. He was for emancipation. He was for emancipating the white man as well as the black.

Mr. Holmes asked: Is not that altogether accomplished?

The President replied that he did not think the question fully settled. The question as to whether the black man shall be engrafted in the Constitution will be settled as we go along. He would not disguise the fact that while he had been persecuted and denounced at the South as a traitor, he loved the great mass of the Southern people. He opposed the Rebellion at its breaking out and fought it everywhere, and now wanted the principles of the government carried out and maintained.

Mr. Holmes interrupted by saying "We want to get back to the same position as you describe, as we are without law, no courts are open, and you have the power to assist us."

The President replied that the government cannot go on until it is based on right. The people of South Carolina must have a convention and amend their constitution by abolishing slavery, and this must be done in good faith, and the convention or Legislature must adopt the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which prohibits and excludes slavery everywhere.

One of the delegates said we are most anxious for civil rule, for we have had more than enough of military despotism.

The President, resuming, said that as the Executive, he could only take the initiatory steps to enable them to do the things which it was incumbent upon them to perform.

Another of the delegates remarked that it was assumed in some parts of this country that, in consequence of the Rebellion, the Southern States had forfeited their rights as members of the Confederacy, and that if restored it could only be on certain conditions, one of which was that slavery shall be abolished. This could be done only through a convention.

The President replied that the friction of the Rebellion had rabbed slavery out, but it would be better so to declare by law. As one of the delegates had just remarked that the constitution of South Carolina did not establish slavery, it were better to insert a clause antagonistic to slavery.

President Johnson asked the delegates to submit whom they would prefer as Provisional Governor. To this they replied they had a list of five men, viz.: Aiken, McClahany, Boyce, Col. Manning, late Governor, and B. F. Perry. All of them were spoken of *as good men, but who had been more or less involved in the rebellion.* Mr. Perry was a *District Judge in the Confederacy until it collapsed*, and is said to have *always been a good Union man* and a gentleman of strict integrity. The people certainly would respect him, and he could not fail to be acceptable.

The President said he knew Benjamin F. Perry well, having served with him in Congress. There was no spirit of vengeance or vindictiveness on the part of the Government, whose only desire was to restore the relations which formerly existed. He was not now prepared to give them an answer as to whom he should appoint; but at the Cabinet meeting next Tuesday he would repeat the substance of this interview, with a view to the restoration which the gentlemen present earnestly desired.

The delegates seemed to be pleased with the proceedings, and lingered for some time to individually converse with the President.

ALLEGHANY COUNTY, PA.

At a large and influential Union County Convention, assembled at Pittsburg, Major A. M. Brown, chairman, the "Union men of Alleghany County" resolved,

"That it is the imperative duty of the government, as well as the best means of establishing peace upon a sure and permanent basis, and of insuring tranquillity throughout the seceded States, to do justice to its friends as well as to punish its enemies; and therefore that it is the part both of wisdom and justice to protect the loyal people of the South without regard to race or color in the same enjoyment of the rights and privileges of citizenship, and to prevent the late leaders of the rebellion from assuming control of public affairs in the States they have misled and betrayed, and from establishing a system of caste aristocracy on the ruins of the late Slaveholders' Confederacy.

"That the people of the loyal States who have prosecuted the war to a successful conclusion, and thereby sustained the Constitution and preserved the government, have the right, through their representatives in Congress, to determine the conditions upon which the people of the revolting States shall be permitted to reorganize their State governments, and to exercise the rights and powers of States under the Constitution.

"That to permit any of the seceded States to resume the exercise of the rights and powers in the Union, while refusing to guarantee, by constitutional enactment, to the loyal colored people of such States, the enjoyment of all the rights of citizenship, including the elective franchise, on the same terms and to the same extent as they may be guaranteed to the white people of those States, would be inconsistent with sound policy and the dictates of true patriotism, they having performed well and truly their part in the great struggle for national life."

NEGRO LABOR.

THE COMBINATIONS AND PUBLIC MEETINGS IN VIRGINIA TO REGULATE WAGES FOR FREEDMEN.—GEN. HARTSUFF PROHIBITS THEM IN HIS DISTRICT.

The following order has just been issued by Major-Gen. Hartsuff, commanding the District of Nottoway, Va.:

Headquarters District of the Nottoway,
Petersburgh, Va., June 22, 186[illegible]

General Orders No. 8—1. Until the civil authority is fully restored, no more public meetings of citizens will be held within the limits of this command to establish a fixed price for negro labor, or to make distinctions prejudicial to the interests, and limiting the freedom, of the blacks. Such meetings are combinations which will result in injury to both parties. The proceedings in this respect of those already held are disapproved.

Commanding officers of counties will see that the amount paid for labor is sufficient to meet all the necessary expenses of food and clothing, besides a reasonable sum for the contingencies of sickness, etc. No difference in price for the same amount, kind, and quality of labor, will be permitted between whites and blacks. All the circumstances in each case will be carefully considered, and when a former master hires his former slave, and, in addition, keeps, feeds, and clothes his family or some of his young, or old and helpless relatives, who would otherwise become a tax and burden upon the laborer, the cost of their maintenance will be considered as a part of the laborer's wages.

If the laborer is hired for a year, the rate per month may reasonably be less than when hired from month to month.

Measures will be taken to insure the fulfilment of contracts on the part of both parties, and the interests of each will be looked to equally.

Commanding officers of sub-districts will have these directions strictly carried out. To the end, and for the purpose of keeping themselves thoroughly acquainted with the condition of affairs under their charge, they will visit all the stations of troops within their respective commands once each month.

By command of Major-Gen. Hartsuff.
J. M. Howard, Major and A. A. G.

SENATOR SHERMAN ON NEGRO SUFFRAGE.

From a speech by Senator Sherman, of Ohio, delivered at Circleville, Ohio, June 10, we extract the following:

And first, as to the former slaves of the South, we promised them their freedom by every mode by which one people may speak to another. We proclaimed it by the proclamation of Mr. Lincoln. Congress twice ratified this proclamation, and the people in two annual elections have ratified it. These slaves have won their freedom by their devotion to our cause. They have from the beginning been true friends. They have borne our flag in battle. They have carried our arms. They have been slaughtered for our cause. They have aided our sick and wounded. They have fed our soldiers when in prison, and have guided their escape. They have performed the humble offices of the camp and the hospital. They never fought against us. They have relied upon our promise, and have performed their part. Without them, and without their presence as a weakness to the enemy, we might not have succeeded. By their ample faith in us, following our fleets and our armies, they have earned their freedom. The enemy know and confess that an *inevitable* incident of their overthrow *is the freedom* of the slave. I therefore conclude that we must secure them their freedom beyond all doubt or peradventure, and maintain it against every danger in any form of reconstruction that may be adopted.

WHO SHALL VOTE IN THE SOUTH.

Will you, in addition, authorize them to vote? Will you invest them with all the rights and incidents of citizenship? Have you the power to do it under the Constitution of the United States? It is perfectly clear that, unless the powers of the Rebel States are changed or affected by the Rebellion, Congress cannot fix the qualification of a voter within a State. The Constitution provided but for three elections: of President, of Senators, and of Representatives. The President is chosen by electors appointed in such manner as the Legislature of the State may elect. Senators are chosen by the Legislatures of the respective States, and members are chosen by the people of the respective States, and the electors of each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature. If anything is clear, it is that the framers of the Constitution meant that each State should prescribe who should vote. The only limitation upon this power is the duty of the National Government to maintain in each State a Republican form of Government. But again the question recurs, is not all this changed in a State where the voters have voluntarily renounced their allegiance to the General Government? Can such a State renounce all its duties, and yet insist upon its rights? It is generally admitted, and is certainly very clear, that the United States may punish a traitor by depriving him of his life, his property, and his franchise. If one, why not all who are equally guilty? If the entire voting population have openly revolted against their allegiance, it is absurd to say that we have power to kill them, and yet have no power to prevent their voting. Again, can we punish the counterfeiter of our coin with disfranchisement, and yet not so punish a traitor? If one, why not all? But it is said that if the loyal people are left who can vote. It is a sad fact, but a true one, that the number of such people in the Southern States would form a very narrow foundation for a Republican Government. North Carolina and Tennessee may contain enough such. President Johnson intends to try the experiments in those States, but I fear he will find the spirit of Rebellion too deep rooted in those who have taken the oath to make them good citizens. How is it when you come to South Carolina and Mississippi? It is said, establish in these a military government. Well, for a time, that may do, but it is expensive and contrary to the spirit of our institutions. If we can put negro regiments there and give them the bayonets, why can't we give them votes? Both are weapons of offence and defence. Votes are cheaper and better. Both are part of the military necessity put upon us by the Rebellion. Both are unpleasant to the Rebels, but medicines are not usually savory. I conclude, on this subject of negro voting, that in all States which can claim their full rights under the Constitution, it is a question for the State, and that in revolted States it is a question of policy and military government, to be decided by the national authority until the State is fully restored to its former condition. In some of the Southern States it would leave them under military rule until they provided the only sure security for the future; that the negroes should have their share in reconstruction, as they have borne their share in fighting. Negro voting may not suit our natural prejudices of caste. They may be ignorant, docile, easily led, and not safely trusted with political power; but if you admit all this, they have been true and faithful among the faithless. They have joined in putting down the Rebellion; and now to place them at the mercy of those they have helped us to subdue—to deny them all political rights—to give them freedom but leave them entirely subject to laws framed by Rebel masters—is an act of injustice against which humanity revolts. Suppose you deny them suffrage, what then? The Southern States gain by the freedom of their slaves fourteen new members of Congress and as many electoral votes. Not three-fifths but five-fifths are counted. If you give the same men who revolted increased political power, what safety have you? Suppose ten years ago they had this additional power, Kansas would have been a slave State this day, and they would have had ample political power to subvert your government without a resort to arms. We must have security for the future. All the evils that I perceive may arise from a mixed voting population are insignificant compared with the only two alternatives—the restoring to Rebels vast political power, and the danger and vast expense of military government.

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Acknowledgments etc., from March 1., to June 1., 1865.
[*Concluded.*]

1301	Thos. T. Sherwin, Dedham Ms.		$ 6 00
1300	J. S. Dewey, Harlem N.Y..		7 05
1321	Mrs. Eunice Collins, Bordentown N.J.		3 00
1308	Jno. Ferris, Wilmington Del.,		4 50
1300	Samuel R. Shipley, Philadelphia Pa.,		4 50
1305	E. A. Hallowell, Philadelphia Pa.,		4 60
1312	J. L. Hallowell,	"	3 00
1295	Dr. C. Herring,	"	6 00
1334	Elizabeth Clendenon	"	3 00
1300	Jacob Grim,	"	3 00
1308	A. B. Justice,	"	6 00
1329	Joseph Fussel,	"	5 00
1312	Geo. H. Earle,	"	3 00
1300	Thomas Mott,	"	4 00
1300	J. V. Watson,	"	2 90
1308	E. W. Clark,	"	2 08
1301	Alf. H. Love,	"	4 20
1366	Danl. Neall,	"	10 00
1300	Anna E. Dickinson,	"	1 04
1352	Jas. Mott,	"	7 00
1307	E. F. Houghton,	"	4 00
1334	J. Bateman,	"	5 00
1282	Mr. J. Fred. Dennis,	"	3 00
1300	Jas. A. Wright	"	4 00
1282	Wm. B. Thomas,	"	5 00
1300	Joshua Madeley,	"	1 96
1334	Mary Grew,	"	3 00
1334	Margaret J. Burleigh,	"	3 00
1275	Jno. R. Wildman,	"	3 00
1334	Edward Hopper,	"	3 00
1300	Rebecca S. Hart.	"	1 00
1300	Pliny E. Chase,	"	2 50
1308	Jacob M. Ellis,	"	4 62
1300	Christiana Konigmacker	"	7 00
1300	Henry Hawthorne,	"	4 00
1300	Sarah J. Webb,	"	1 04
1300	Jas. S. Mason,	"	4 00
1300	Ezekiel Hunn,	"	4 00
1300	Jonathan Wright,	"	1 04
1300	Capt. W. Whildin,	"	2 34
1300	Margaret Jones,	"	7 00
1300	John Sellers,	"	4 00
1308	Dr. C. Neidhard,	"	4 50
1300	Thomas Wakeman,	"	1 04
1278	Samuel T. Child,	"	1 04
1296	Wm. Sellers,	"	4 50
1300	Jacob C. White,	"	4 00
1300	John S. Curby,	"	3 50
1300	John M. Ogden,	"	1 50
1300	Lydia Ann Alberger,	"	1 50
1300	Nathan W. Ellis,	"	4 00
1300	Sarah Lloyd,	"	1 04
1300	Huldah Justice,	"	1 80
1366	Dr. Chas. Noble,	"	13 50
1304	Jos. M. Truman, Jr.	"	3 00
1334	Isaac Harding,	"	3 00
1313	Annie Churchman,	"	7 50
1334	Anna H. Parry,	"	3 00
1308	Richard Parry,	"	4 50
1313	John Williams,	"	4 50
1313	William Trantwine,	"	4 50
1310	William Thorne,	"	4 50
1299	Benj. P. Hunt,	"	3 00
1300	Jas. W. Johns,	"	4 50
1308	Isaac R. Wright,	"	4 50
1334	Benj. Lloyd.	"	1 50
1308	John F. Gilpen,	"	4 50
1299	Rebecca Sellers,	"	3 00
1308	Jennette Jackson,	"	3 00
1313	Marmaduke C. Cope,	"	4 50
1299	Catherine M. Shipley,	"	3 00
1300	R. Fausett,	"	3 00
	Fem. A. S. Society,	"	150 00
1300	J. W. Sutherland, Perkiomen Bridge Pa.,		4 00
1217	Wm. E. Corson, Shannonville Pa.,		4 00
1230	Thomas Hopkins,	"	3 00
1375	John S. Mann, Coudersport	"	3 50
1315	M. E. & R. Martindale, Newtown	"	1 50
1334	Mary Pickering,	"	3 00
1308	Wilhelmina Hough,	"	4 50
1295	Alice M. Twining,	"	3 00
1304	Susan C. Buckman,	"	3 00
1308	John Smith. Buckmanville	"	3 00
1300	Joseph Betts, Taylorsville	"	5 32
1300	Abner Bradfield, Abington	"	4 00
1300	Seth Pancoast, Marple	"	4 00
1334	Joseph Haines, Caines	"	4 05
1330	Samuel McFarland, Washington	"	5 00
1243	Hannah [illegible]mbler, Penllyn	"	3 00
1334	O. Conrad, Whitemarsh	"	3 00
1308	Elizabeth Cheney, Cheney P.O.	"	1 50
1300	Sarah Comly, Milton	"	1 05
1339	Elizabeth Hudson, H. C. Works	"	10 00
1265	John Trayner, Hayesville	"	5 00
1334	Chas Hambleton, Elk View	"	3 00
1352	Jos. A. Smith, Pineville	"	2 00
1334	Sallie E. Longshore, "	"	3 00
1334	Geo. Wanger, Pottstown	"	3 00
1270	Maria Harley, "	"	1 50
1300	Jas. Townsend, Byberry	"	3 00
1334	Elizabeth Warner, Bristol	"	3 00
1313	A. & M. W. Pugh, Oxford	"	5 00
1334	H. Williams, Huntingdon Valley	"	50
1282	Mary B. Pemberton, Darby	"	3 00
1334	Jos. Moore, Christiana	"	3 00
1334	Joshua Hoopes, West Chester	"	3 00
1347	A. M. Dobson, "	"	3 00
1378	Dr. J. K. Eshleman, Downingt'n	"	5 50
1272	Jacob Peirce, Kennett Square	"	2 50
1346	Sarah Heston, Penn's Park	"	3 00
1308	Wm. Lloyd, Dolington	"	1 50
1300	Isaac Sharpless, Williston Inn	"	1 00
1282	Francis Kerbaugh, Nicetown	"	1 50
1286	John R. Major, Norristown	"	15 00
1300	Mary Woodman, Wrightstown	"	3 00
1326	Eleanor Brinton, Gap	"	3 00
1334	W. Speakman, Doe Run	"	3 00
1320	Rachel B. Walton, New Brighton	"	1 50
1362	W. C. Gildersleeve, Wilkesbarre	"	4 00
1326	E. Adela Hibbs, Brownsburgh	"	1 00
1312	Jos. Lewis, Birdsboro	"	3 00
1309	L. Brinker, Pleasant Valley	"	5 00
1317	John Palmer, Falsington	"	5 00
1352	D. C. Thayer, Linesville	"	3 50
1300	Daniel Kauffman, Boiling Springs	"	7 00
1282	William Robinson, Pulaski	"	6 00
1272	Rev. A. B. Bradford, Enon Valley	"	2 10
1300	A. Burton, Tullytown	"	2 30
1350	Lorinda Wicker, Miller's Farm	"	3 00
1300	Milton Fussell, Reeseville	"	4 00
1308	D. Morehart, Alvira	"	1 50
1303	Mrs. John Dunholm, N. Alex'dria	"	7 50
1300	Y. M. Men Library Ass'n Cin., O.		5 50
1254	Evan Stephens, Martinsville O.		3 00
1330	John G. McClain, Scio	"	3 00
1300	George Riker, N. Philadelp'a	"	2 20
1270	Seth C. Parker, Steuben	"	3 00
1333	B. O. Knight, Leesville	"	3 00
1300	E. Adams, Akron	"	2 03
1300	John Galbraith, Union	"	2 00
1285	Sarah Bown, Salem	"	3 00
1338	Joseph Ingram, "	"	5 00
1334	R. L. Atchison, Magadore	"	5 00
1317	Samuel Erwin, Columbiana	"	3 00
1302	J. W. Suliot, Franklin Mills	"	3 00
1207	Wm. Norton, N. Harrisburgh	"	3 00
1312	R. Wilson,	"	3 00
1322	J. H. Richardson, West Unity	"	3 50
1310	J. M. Brown, Massillon	"	7 50
1318	Elizabeth S. Clyne, Hinckley	"	3 00
1310	J. S. Boynton, Stryker	"	3 00
1301	C. Sherman, Brunswick	"	2 00
1300	M. Hibbard, Fitchville	"	3 00
1306	Joseph Mead, Lloydsville	"	3 00
1356	Robert Hillis, Alliance	"	2 50
1292	Hoopes Bailey, Smith'ld Station	"	2 00
1302	D. F. Stickney, Painesville	"	5 00
1334	Nathan Rockhill, Smith'ld "	"	3 00
1337	Gurdon Purdy, Atwater	"	3 00
1293	James Doud, "	"	88
1341	Rev. E. C. Sharp, "	"	2 12
1368	Samuel Scantlebury, Bloomington Ill.		1 50
1300	A. C. Edgar, Mt. Carmel	"	3 00
1299	George Lynn, Lockport	"	3 00
1306	Sarah C. Harris, Galena	"	4 00
1308	R. M. Elliott, Marion	"	4 50
1304	W. H. Herndon, Springfield	"	3 00
1315	Samuel Hayball, Adrian Mich.		5 00
1348	Frank I. Jones, "	"	2 50
1330	Sarah C. Owen, Ypsilanti	"	2 00
1328	John S. Bagg, Detroit	"	2 50
1295	L. Taylor, Jordon Wis.		2 50
1327	B. Ballard, Lancaster "		3 00
1326	Catherine M. Goff, Cedar Rapids Iowa		5 50
1326	James Jemess, Gem	"	1 50
1300	E. Booth, Anamosa	"	3 00
1312	Jonas Hartzell, Davenport	"	3 00
1300	Edward Sawyer, Dubuque	"	4 00
1309	Elisha Erwin, West Liberty	"	1 00
1331	Capt. H. F. Douglass, F't Lea'worth Kansas		2 00
1295	D. Pound, Boulder City Nevada		5 00
1276	C. H. Eastman, Virginia City "		5 00
1303	Azariah Smith, Nashville Tenn.		2 00
1334	Miss H. W. Murray, Port Royal So. Caro.,		5 00
1326	Redpath Institute, Charleston	"	1 50
1308	Laura Towne, Beaufort	"	4 50
1311	Pliny F. Sexton, Key West Florida		1 00
1335	S. J. W. Taber, Washington D. C.,		3 00
1300	Rev. W. H. Channing,	"	6 00
1300	Geo. E. Baker,	"	3 00
1300	D. Lyman Jr.	"	3 00
1300	Clara Barton,	"	1 50
1334	Mary Fletcher, Lancashire Eng.,		4 46
1334	Mary A. Estlin, Bristol	"	5 57
1334	Wilson Armistead, Leeds	"	5 57
1334	Miss Whitelegge, Manchester	"	5 57
1334	Miss R. Walton, "	"	5 57
1300	Mrs. Ashurst Biggs, Kent	"	2 78
1300	Jos. S. Scowby, Yorkshire	"	5 57
1334	Miss Paton, Glasgow	"	5 57
1334	Mrs. Robert Smith,	"	11 14
1334	L. E. Society, Edinburgh	"	14 76
1334	Mary Shackleton, Ballitore Ireland		5 57
1334	Richard Allen, Dublin	"	11 14
1334	Mrs. Edmundson, "	"	5 57
1334	Miss Ireland, Belfast	"	5 57

DONATIONS AND PLEDGES.

J. Bateman, Philadelphia Pa.,	5 00
Richmond Martin, N. York City	6 00
James Mott, Philadelphia Pa.,	3 00
Richard Martin, N. Y. C., Pledge at A. Meeting	10 00
Joseph T. Curry, " "	1 00
Collections at Annual Meeting	117 60

UNITED STATES

SEVEN-THIRTY LOAN.

THIRD SERIES.

$230,000,000.

By authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, the undersigned, the General Subscription Agent for the sale of United States Securities, offers to the public the Third Series of Treasury Notes, bearing seven and three-tenths per cent. interest per annum, known as the

7-30 LOAN.

These Notes are issued under date of July 15, 1865, and are payable three years from that date, in currency, or are convertible at the option of the holder into

U. S. 5-20 SIX PER CENT.

GOLD BEARING BONDS.

These bonds are now worth a handsome premium, and are exempt, as are all the Government Bonds, *from State, County, and Municipal taxation, which adds from one to three per cent. more to their value*, according to the rate levied upon other property. The interest is payable semi-annually by coupons attached to each note, which may be cut off and sold to any bank or banker.

The interest at 7-30 per cent. amounts to
One cent per day on a $50 note.
Two cents per day on a $100 note.
Ten cents per day on a $500 note.
Twenty cents per day on a $1,000 note.
One dollar per day on a $5,000 note.

Notes of all denominations named will be promptly furnished upon receipt of subscriptions.

The notes of this Third Series are precisely similar in form and privileges to the Seven-Thirties already sold, except that the Government reserves to itself the option of paying interest in gold coin at 6 per cent. instead of 7 3-10ths in currency. Subscribers will deduct the interest in currency up to July 15, at the time when they subscribe.

The delivery of the notes of this Third Series of the Seven-thirties will commence on the 1st of June, and will be made promptly and continuously after that date.

The slight change made in the conditions of this THIRD SERIES affects only the matter of interest. The payment in gold, if made, will be equivalent to the currency interest of the higher rate.

The return to specie payments, in the event of which only will the option to pay interest in gold be availed of, would so reduce and equalize prices as that purchases made with six per cent. in gold would be fully equal to those made with seven and three-tenths per cent in currency. This is

THE ONLY LOAN IN MARKET

Now offered by the Government, and its superior advantages make it the

GREAT POPULAR LOAN OF THE PEOPLE.

Less than $230,000,000 of the Loan authorized by Congress are now in the market. This amount, at the rate at which it is being absorbed, will all be subscribed for within sixty days, when the notes will undoubtedly command a premium, as has uniformly been the case on closing the subscriptions to other Loans.

In order that citizens of every town and section of the country may be afforded facilities for taking the Loan, the National Banks, State Banks, and Private Bankers throughout the country have generally agreed to receive subscriptions at par. Subscribers will select their own agents, in whom they have confidence, and who only are to be responsible for the delivery of the notes for which they receive orders.

JAY COOKE,
SUBSCRIPTION AGENT,
NO. 114 S. THIRD STREET,
6—tf. PHILADELPHIA.

THE LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.—This Society is earnestly engaged in publishing works that will materially aid the Anti-Slavery cause. The Society is circulating freely the writings of Dr. Lieber on the Amendment of the Constitution. It has published the speech of the Hon. M. E. Kelley, W. W. Broom's work on the "Crimes of the South," and Mr. Nordhoff's useful condensation of Olmsted's Travels. Large quantities of these works have been sent to Charleston, Richmond, Kentucky, Wilmington, and Arkansas. The Society has determined to do all it can for the utter extinction of slavery in our Republic. The rooms of the Society are at 863 Broadway.

PINEAPPLE CIDER

Dr. Talbot's Concentrated Medical Pineapple Cider

Will cure you if you are sick; and if you are well will prevent sickness. See long advertisement in the *Ambassador*, from Oct 1864 to April 1865. Send for circular. One oz. sample bottle mailed free on receipt of 30 cents for postage.

B. T. BABBITT,
5—6m. 64 to 74 Washington Street, N. Y.

PRACTICAL PREACHING.—Market Value of a Soul; Work-Day Religion; Beauty of Faith; An Appeal from the South; New Dictionary of Phrenology and Physiognomy, with 10 Illustrations, in JULY DOUBLE NO. Phrenological Journal. New Volume; $2 a year.

LOVE AND LOVERS.—Selecting Congenial Companions for Life; Sensible Advice, with Rules to be observed; Maidens' Eyes, a Poem, in JULY—Double—No. Phrenological Journal. 20 cents, by first post.

SECOND MARRIAGES—Are they admissable? Object of marriage stated—Second Love—Interference of Relatives, Step-Mothers—a Hint to Maiden Ladies—Adopting Children—A Hymeneal Poem. In JULY—Double—No. Phrenological Journal. For a copy, send 20 cents to Messrs. FOWLER & WELLS, 389 Broadway, N. Y.

PHYSIOGNOMY OF THE CONSPIRATORS—How they Look—Mrs. Surratt—Harold—Payne—Atzerot—O'Laughlin—Spangler—Dr. Mudd—and Arnold; with personal descriptions, in JULY Double No. Phrenological Journal. 20 cents. Newsmen have it.

VICTORIA, Queen of England, and EUGENIE, Empress of France, with excellent portraits and brief sketches of these distinguished ladies, in JULY Double No. Phrenological Journal. Only 20 cents by first post. Address FOWLER & WELLS, N. Y.

DEFECTIVE ORIGINAL COPY

Miscellaneous Department.

Continued Oppression, and not God's Judgments, the Reason for Fasting.

DR. CHEEVER'S SERMON, CONCLUDED.

Delivered in the Church of the Puritans, Thursday evening, June 1, 1865.

Isaiah 59: 5. They hatch cockatrice's eggs, and weave the spider's web. He that eateth of their eggs dieth, and that which is crushed breaketh out into a viper.

THIS is the fruit of oppressive legislation, the result of the policy of those that decree unrighteous decrees, and that water grievousness which they have prescribed, to turn aside the needy from judgment and to take away the right from the poor of my people. Meantime, none calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth. By such policy, the very crushing of slavery breaks out into a viper. And this is the iniquity, that is now being spread like a spider's poisonous web, as if it were the unwinding and weaving of a cockatrice's cocoon, over our land. No language could more forcibly and tersely describe the nature of our present unrighteous policy against the colored race, *to take away the right from the poor of my people*. And meantime, *none calleth for justice*.

But the result is just as plain. "Their webs shall not become garments, neither shall they cover themselves with their works." They might as well have put on a shirt of fire and brimstone. The act of violence is in their hands; wasting and destruction are in their paths. The way of peace they know not, and there is no judgment in their goings. They have made them crooked paths; whosoever goeth therein shall not know peace. Let the nation try it, and see which is true, God or man, and which the strongest, God or this accursed policy of injustice.

It is born of slavery, but what is worse than all, it is born of our own perversion of God's mercy in the destruction of slavery. That is, we are using the power which God has put in our hands by his own overwhelming of the rebellion and of slavery together for us, to crush the delivered slaves, as black men, by virtue of their color, under the feet of their oppressors. We are doing this, *for* their oppressors; and yet, the race against whom we are doing this is the race by whom, and for whose sake, God saves us thus far, and has given us such wonderful deliverance from our crimes. In delivering the slaves from their enemies, God has delivered us. But if their deliverance is into the hands of our oppressive legislation, it might be a question whether it had not been better for them to have remained yet longer slaves; for they only go out from one fire into another fire to devour them. But God will not suffer it; and we fully believe that we shall be destroyed, but not they, if we persevere in this oppressive policy. Our webs of injustice against them shall never become garments for ourselves. Thus far we are involuntary, and for a long time were ever unwilling in our deliverance of the slaves; we are voluntary only in our own injustice against them.

And God has punished us, in not permitting us the glory and the blessedness of accomplishing this deliverance of our own accord, and by our own justice. The prey is taken from the mighty, but it is not we who delivered it. "He shall let go my captives;" but we let them go, only because God felled us to the ground, and would not let us rise again, except by the release of those whom we kept prisoners, whom we held helpless, for the South to put their chains upon. We of the North did it. We acted the part of brawny blacksmiths for the South, to do the work of fastening the fetters for their slaves, with patent Constitutional securities, that only the combination of Yankee political sagacity and flunkeyism could have wrought out.

The same work on a lower scale, a meaner scale, is being done over again. We are contriving Constitutional necessities, under pretence of which the whites of the South may take the blacks and trample upon them at pleasure. Even when God has taken away the instrument and the word *slavery*, both out of their and our power, we offer them the instrument of *color* and the word *white*. It is just as if we saw the club of a giant broken in the attempt to kill his victim, and offered him a slung shot of our own, with which to bring him down. It is just as when merchants and statesmen in England, finding the navy of the Confederate pirates destroyed, put the Alabama, and a fleet of blockade runners at their disposal. *De te fabula narratur.*

You cannot make such a career look bright in history. We see the account of a toad recently found in a perfect, compact, and sound block of the magnesian limestone, twenty-five feet from the surface, alive and vigorous, and differing very little from the toads of the present day. A geologist, for the sake of some assumed theory of creation, might more innocently and surely attempt to deny that this was a toad, and to prove that it was a butterfly, or that the rock in which it was found was petrified cheese, than a christian man, for the sake of our reputation with posterity, deny the existence and the evidence of our great crime, or set, for historic preservation, the form of a sleeping angel, or of assured justice, as the image of our character, instead of the serpent, or the toad, or the alligator.

Nothing in nature is so bad as the combination of injustice and ingratitude in man. How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is to have a thankless child! But one that, having his own life given him out of the belly of death and hell, by a potent heaven-mingled medicine, will turn round and make the first use of his restored existence to poison the existence of his brother, is a monster, for whose description even Shakspeake has created no image. But it will be down in history, the treatment of the colored race by whom and for whose sake God has delivered us. It is already there, in the very record of the hour when we were proclaiming ourselves as the Emancipators of mankind, and regenerators of society. The very first use which our Secretary of State is said to have made of his wounded arm, just released from its bandages, was to countersign the proclamation taking away from the colored inhabitants of the State of North Carolina the right to vote, as citizens of the United States, and bestowing that right upon the white inhabitants, who, by their treason four years ago, carried the State into Secession from the Union, and into armed rebellion against the government.

This cruelty towards a class derives, perhaps, its first and darkest characteristic of baseness from its ingratitude and impiety toward God. This striking against a race, is striking against a Saviour, theirs and ours. It is striking against Africa, and against the commission and opportunities of our usefulness there.

NATURE OF THIS ATTEMPT.—IT IS A CONSPIRACY.

The restriction of suffrage to the whites is a conspiracy of selfishness and despotism against the blacks. It is not to secure the right of suffrage to the whites that the designation *white* is put in, for there is no question, never was, and never will be, of that right—no threat, nor intimation, nor danger of the whites' losing it, no need of any security for it, nor any more necessity of any guarantee for it than for the privilege of breathing the common air. But it is to kill and destroy the right of suffrage for the blacks. The conspirators could not stab their victim but behind this shield. And whoever constructs or affords this shield for them strikes their blow, does their work. Just as the man who bored the hole in the door of the box at the theatre where the President was assassinated, in order that through it the assassin might be sure of his aim; and just as the man who chiselled the mortise and set the beam against the door on the inside, that the assassin might not be interrupted and caught; just so the man who presents this word *white*, the statesman who imposes this word as the condition of the vote, the government that accepts and sanctions it, does it for the sake of covertly, safely, and certainly striking the blacks, for the sake of making the blow more deadly, by hiding it. These parties hold down the victim, for others to strike; these parties arrange the box, prepare the mortise and the beam, to make it equally impossible either that the victim should escape, and be delivered, or the criminal brought to justice.

It would probably be impossible to adduce any instance in the history of civilization of such cruelty and contempt of law and of right on the part of any government toward one class of its innocent citizens, combined with such tenderness toward traitors in arms—such carefulness for the rights of rebels, such destruction of the rights of their victims;—such perversion of law on one side for the sanction, protection, and perpetuity of the cruelty of slavery, and on the other side for the shielding of the rebel slaveholders from the just consequence of their crimes. Such has been the favoritism of our government toward slavery, even in the midst of a rebellion for the supremacy of slavery by the destruction of our government. The government—if the President and his policy, apart from Congress, are regarded as the government—are even now providing for the continuance and establishment of that landed aristocracy, for the sake of the privileges and dominion of which the rebellion has been undertaken, and the war of the rebellion waged.

The rights of the slaves are ignored, denied, and permitted to be trampled on; the rights of the rebels are maintained, their inalienable sovereignty over their slaves, and their right of slaveholding, are maintained as perpetual; and the same Constitution which they themselves have rejected, adopting a new one of their own, is preserved and laid up for them, with its law of interpretation in accordance with their own slave-codes, awaiting their return into the Union, their recovery from this nightmare of rebellion, their reception into chambers empty, swept, and garnished, as a company of deluded devils, tempted out of their comfortable chambers in the Union, by the imagination that their privilege of demoniacal possession by human slavery was more secure out of the Union than in it. The same Constitution which they have rejected is being pleaded for them, and an invitation is extended to come back under its protecting power, that they may find their slaveholding privileges laid up for them, according to their own slaveholding theology, an inheritance divine, that nothing can alienate, undefiled, and that fadeth not away.

The yellow fever conspiracy is not more truly a crime against society than this conspiracy to deprive the colored race of their rights. The Blackburns of Confederate diabolism could not be so sure of producing a pestilence by the circulation of their infected clothes as the contrivers and supporters of this attack against the blacks, this national policy of injustice and cruelty, of producing a plague from the wrath of God. The big trunk No. 2, that would kill at sixty yards, was not so fatal, so certain of its mischief, as the proclamation giving the sanction and support of the United States to the contempt and persecution of the colored race by depriving them of the right of suffrage, and licensing and appointing white-washed traitors to vote them down, and by law to degrade them. This conspiracy is more fatal to society than the other. It is more impious towards God. Blackburn's yellow fever could only kill here and there; but the proclamation ostracising the black race, assassinates human rights by the wholesale, and sends down the mortal attainder to posterity.

CONSEQUENCES OF SUCH A CONSPIRACY.

No man and no society can act on Cain's principle, I am not my brother's keeper, without the retributive consequences of such neglect and selfishness. A railway accident not long since happened in England, in the investigation of which it came out that the third class carriages were wheeled with inferior iron; as if there could be this disregard of the safety of one class, without hazard of life to all. Thus in the social state, we are all linked as in a series of rail-carriages, and you cannot by stingy economy or oppression cheapen life in any one but you peril the whole. The neglect may have been intentional only in one compartment, where also you would have confined the mischief, and yet the crash, when it comes, may be the most terrible, not upon that car, but upon the next. The cracked iron of a wheel of a third class carriage may bring the fatal shock of a concussion upon the carriages of the first class. Just thus is society bound together. Neglecting the children of the poor is just providing material for some future fatality upon the rich, but providing for education and welfare of the poor is founding an insurance for the safety of the rich.

He shall save the children of the needy and break the oppressor in pieces. But to prevent the possibility of Christ's kingdom coming, or of believing in it, you have only to exclude from it this care for the needy and oppressed. You have only to establish a class of outcasts, having no rights that Christians with white skins are bound to respect, as the stuff for the unexpelled devils of white christianized society to exercise their passions upon. But you need not suppose you secure your part of the train by putting them into a separate carriage. You might put four millions there, but you are in the same train; for God will not drive a special train for your accommodation; and sooner or later your ungodliness and cruelty will produce a break-up, and your disregard of others' rights will be visited on your own head. The arrangement of a prison instead of a car for the blacks may have been made for the sake of an agreement that the whole train should run, this cruelty having been alleged as the only condition on which you could carry your railroad through the whole country. But this is no justification.

It was not necessary for our social existence that we should have a continuous line of railroad, but it was necessary that we should act justly, and our sacrifice of justice for the sake of Union and peace will be the obstruction of the train, when we think it most prosperous. This is what has happened. It was said that the Union could not have been formed had not slavery been admitted, but it is slavery and that alone which has broken up the Union, and brought the direst of calamities. There is not a more instructive lesson in all history as to the madness of admitting injustice on the ground of expediency. It never can be expedient to be unjust, or to admit injustice into your policy, or the destruction of your neighbor's rights.

CONSEQUENCES ALREADY DEMONSTRATED.

Take the events already transpiring, even before our armies are withdrawn, as an indication of what we may expect when tyranny has come to its own again, as in the old cavalier song of Charles' time in England. The rebels bear rule. Union men in the South, on returning from the North, are exposed to social persecution. Black men are the objects of increased hatred and cruelty. "A black girl late a slave was brought into our lines cut and lacerated from having been terribly scourged by her rebel master, because she refused to work without pay. Gen. Gregg, the commandant, ordered his arrest, but the woman whipper had fled." When the military commandership exists no longer, what security will there be against such outrages, or what protection of the rights of those that are oppressed? And what kind of legislation there will be in place of government legislation, may be judged by the announcement, that "in the election for the House of Delegates yesterday the Disunionists swept Virginia so far as known. In the Alexandria district, a candidate who has a bitter hatred to the Union, and *became a cripple in the rebel service*, has been elected to the Rebel Senate, and one no less bitter to the House. This man took the oath of allegiance only the night before he announced himself as a candidate." Here we see rebels, traitors, rewarded for their treason by the right of suffrage conferred upon them, and set up for election to the ruling offices of the State, while loyal subjects are rewarded for their loyalty by being deprived of the right of suffrage on account of the color of their skin, and are thrown down under the feet of the rebels by the United States Government, to be trampled upon at their the rebels', pleasure, because the government have taken away their arms from them, their means of protection by the ballot.

WHAT IT WOULD BE, IF AGAINST THE WHITES.

Before God and man I affirm that it is a criminal conspiracy against a class of loyal unoffending persons entitled to the same protection as ourselves. It is a conspiracy of such a nature as would, if attempted against an equal number of the whites, throw the whole nation into a revolution and a bloody exterminating war. And if the President of the United States lent his arm and the power of his office to the support of such a conspiracy of the blacks against the whites, he would not retain his office six months. If the black population in any State got possession of the supremacy, and used it for the purpose of excluding the whites from any share in the government, and if when it was proposed to submit the whole question to the whole people, the President put forth a proclamation forbidding the whites to vote, and affirming that only the blacks could constitutionally be permitted to vote, I venture to affirm that the President would be consigned to a lunatic asylum in the hands of an extemporized commission of lunacy, before he could begin to act upon such a plan, or get even a *posse comitatus* for its execution.

BY WHAT AUTHORITY.

By what authority does the President impose and execute new and radical laws and modes of government, according to his own opinion on the difference of skins; and who gave him this authority? Did it come from Him who hath made of one blood all the nations, and before whom the government of this country is sworn to administer justice without respect to persons. The right of governing any portion of the United States, is vested explicitly by the Constitution in the Congress; and although the President is Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, yet, even for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, the Congress has the sole prerogative of making rules; how much more for the government of the people of any conquered portion of the country in rebellion.

But if the President assumes the appointment of what is called a military governor, and the authority of regulating by him, even the elementary processes and conditions of elections by the people, and at his own discretion can command or forbid the very right of voting, this authority is supreme, and he can say that all men, if any, shall exercise that right, who are not expressly forbidden by the Constitution, or by some United States' laws in pursuance of the same. If he has the power, which he has not, of excluding any class, he has the same power of admitting that class, and consequently if he excludes any class not excluded by the Constitution, or admits to sovereign power over the rest a particular class not so appointed by the Constitution, it is nothing less than usurpation.

JUSTICE TANEY'S DECISION OVER AGAIN.

If he orders the colored race in any State, by virtue of the color of their skin, to be excluded from the right of voting, it is as direct and manifest a usurpation as if he had ordered them all to be shut up in prison. If he does this on the ground that it used to be done before the rebellion, and the old precedents are the ruling authority still, it is precisely the same affirmation and reasoning from assumption by which Justice Taney selected and established his rule for the treatment of the colored race—that black men have no rights that white men are bound to respect. But, if any part of their old laws and usages are in force under the Constitution, every part is, the Constitution itself not having been altered; and the right to exclude negroes from voting is no more sacred, nor to be regarded, or enforced by the President, than the right to compel negroes to work without wages. The President has just as good a right to submit to the people of North Carolina the decision of the question, Shall the negroes again be made slaves? and to say, at the same time, that the negroes shall be excluded from voting upon this question of their own treatment, because they are black, as to submit the question, Shall the negroes be deprived of the suffrage-right of citizens? and to say that only the whites shall be admitted to vote upon this question, because they are white, and the blacks shall be excluded because they are black, and because, on account of their color, it is pretended, they always have been excluded.

This is false. And who does not see that the pretence of submitting this question to a legislature or convention, chosen only by the whites, is a mere farce, the question being already determined by the very arrangements for its settlement. That was the method in the government ordained by Gen. Banks and the President in Louisiana, where twelve thousand white men, voting under bayonet, took away from sixty thousand colored men the right of voting at all. Whether this be that republican form of government which the United States are bound by the Constitution to secure to the people of every State, God will judge. From the examination of the principles of justice, as set forth in God's Word, and from the review of the judgments of God upon us in the past four years, I do not think we have any reason to suppose that we can commit this crime and escape with impunity. Perhaps it is more likely to prove our destruction than slavery itself.

THE EXASPERATIONS OF THIS CRIME.

For there are three great exasperations. (1.) That it is the deliberate choice of an unjust policy when the just was equally in our power. (2.) It is setting a precedent on the side of oppression, and making it national. It is the national government that does this, and the people consenting, it is the nation. We could not abolish slavery till we amended the Constitution, because there was a doubt whether we could do it constitutionally. There is more than a doubt whether we can constitutionally exclude millions of the people from the right of citizenship because of the color of the skin. No qualification being imposed, or disqualification, in the Constitution, it is at least doubtful if we have the right to impose a restriction of the skin and of race. But we do not, on that account, say that we must amend the Constitution before we can inflict that injustice. In the case of justice, we construe the doubt against doing the justice. In the case of injustice, we construe the doubt in favor of committing the injustice. We do not wait to amend the Constitution, in order that we may constitutionally degrade the blacks, but we degrade the blacks by military law. We could not have done it under the Constitution by law, by civil process, in a time of peace; but we are so eager to do it by national edict and authority, that we avail ourselves of the condition of States being under martial law, to do it by military government. We refuse the opportunity which God has given us by that providential supremacy to bless and elevate the colored race, and we avail ourselves of it to degrade and curse them.

We degrade and curse them by color and race, by means of the war-power, when the Constitution, in the time of peace, would have forbidden it. For there is no screw in the Constitution, no cog-wheel, nor lever, nor handle by which we can bring down the pressure of the Constitution to stamp the brand of this national excommunication on color and race. The war-power, by which the slaves have saved our Government from ruin, is the power, the authority upon which our Government seizes them to thrust them down into contempt, disgrace, and torture—the authority to rob them of their rights, and, by the sentence of our fathers, judging such iniquity in their own case, make slaves of them. For our fathers said that to refuse the right of representation was to reduce them to slavery.

(3.) There is still another third exasperation of this wickedness. We curse the race and their posterity. We do it by bill of attainder, against blood, against the color of the skin. We are forbidden by the Constitution from ever sending down the punishment of crime, or any disability, even in penalty of treason, to a man's posterity, by a man's blood; but we send down this exclusion from American citizenship and manhood—this robbery of the one first greatest right, in the universality of which, for all comers, of all nations, we boast our superiority to the nations, as the essence of our republicanism—we send down this cruelty and robbery by attainder of a man's blood, attaching to his posterity, through the color of his skin. We violate solemn treaties by the color of the skin. We oppress a race of millions, set apart for that purpose, and not only make an oligarchy by means of the white skin, but a slavery by means of the black.

It has been slanderously affirmed that our fathers founded a government upon complexional differences. This is a very great and grave falsehood. Under our fathers' Constitution and Government black men voted as well as white; black men were regarded as parts of that *all mankind*, pronounced by our fathers, in the Declaration of Independence, equal before God, and from whose consent, under God, the Government derived its rights.

Now, for the first time in the nation's history, the Government adopts, as national, this usurpation by the color of the skin—this despotism by complexional differences—this attainder of millions, without crime, to constitute a caste of mudsills; they and their posterity, by virtue of God having created them of a different complexion from ourselves, for the oligarchy of the skin to despise and tread upon, they and their posterity, by virtue of a white skin. What the next retributive providence of God in vengeance for this crime may be we cannot tell; but, if it pleased God, we should like to see every person that has had a part in this villainy changed into a black man, and made to endure, in himself and his children, the oppression he has contrived for others.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CARE FOR CHILDREN.

In an address by President Johnson to the children in Washington, he said recently that "under institutions such as ours, he who performs his part well, he who performs all his obligations, will sooner or later be properly estimated and rewarded by his friends, his neighbors, and the nation." Have not the blacks performed their part well, as soldiers and even as slaves always our faithful friends, so that Secretary Seward sent word abroad by way of proving that humanity and the friendship and good will and hopes and confidences of the slaves were on our side in this conflict, that everywhere the negro proved himself our most constant helper, informer, guide, and the protector and deliverer of our forces? And how about the reward of such services and such faithfulness at the hands of those who have thus boasted of them, at the hands of the nation? How does the President himself, and how do the leaders of opinion and authority and patronage in the nation, propose to reward these faithful and long-suffering millions? By taking the common rights of citizens from them; by insulting, betraying, despising, robbing them, because they are blacks. By taking away from them the right to vote, and bestowing that right exclusively upon white rebels and traitors, and throwing the blacks, thus helpless, thus denounced and deserted by the government, into the hands of their oppressors, to do with them, by oppressive enactments, just as they please.

This is the way in which the gratitude of the Republic is to be proved and under institutions such as ours, they, the colored race, who perform their part well, are to be rewarded. This is the method proposed by the President for the elevation of the colored race, in accordance, doubtless, with his own instructions to the children, "that instead of trying to humble those that are inferior, and to make their condition lower, your pride should be to elevate them to the standard that you occupy." In this matter he was an agrarian, meaning to elevate and estimate all in proportion to their virtue and merit. Intrinsic merit should be the base upon which all should stand. He would pull none down, but would elevate all,—level upwards, not downward."

We suppose the exclusion of the colored race from that privilege of voting given to the lowest white traitor and beggar, is the method of levelling upward applied to color. "His notion," the President told the children, had "always been that the great mass of the American people could be elevated. If all will be elevated, we may become the greatest and most exalted nation on the earth."

Exalted over the blacks, exalted by what Senator Sumner has aptly called, A SKIN OLIGARCHY! *If all will be elevated!* And do the negroes refuse to be elevated? Is it not their request, in the name of God, to be regarded as men, and to be elevated to the rank of citizens? Who is it that is pressing them down, and doing everything by law to prevent the possibility of their being elevated? The decree depriving them of the right of suffrage does more to degrade them, and to render all their efforts for their own elevation vain, than any other oppression. And whose is that decree? Whose is the responsibility of making it national? Whom will God judge for it? Is this the way to elevate the mass of the American people? If the President had done this with an equal number of the whites, he would have been cast down from his high office by the people. If the people consent to this iniquity, God will judge both them and him.

THE HABIT OF PREJUDICE, AND DENIAL OF RIGHT.

Not long since there was a report of an intended massacre of rebel soldiers by a party of colored troops in revenge for the massacre of the negroes at Fort Pillow. It was a most shameful falsehood. Immediately, taking this report for true, one of our most respectable daily journals, referred to it as evidence against the race, as being candidates for the right of suffrage. "But who is going to give the right of suffrage to a class that evinces an utter want of self control, or that has so little respect for the supremacy of the laws as to plot a wholesale butchery of the poor deluded victims of Southern treason?" Put the question of the other race. Who is going to give the right of suffrage to a class that evinces such utter want of self-respect, and has so little respect for the supremacy of the laws, as to plan a wholesale destruction of the government and nation, by treason and rebellion, and in the attempt accomplishes the butchery of hundreds of thousands? Yet that is the very class to whom the right of suffrage is given; fresh from the execution of such treason, they are deemed a proper class to exercise the right of suffrage and of government; and while it is taken away from the loyal blacks by the government, it is bestowed upon the whites, who for four years have been in arms against the government; and the very class who took the State government out of the Union are appointed by proclamation to be the very persons who, to the exclusion and degradation of the loyal blacks, shall now govern those States. Nothing could more solemnly disclose the fatal want of justice among us, the fatal abnegation of justice, and the strength of our wicked and cruel prejudice against the colored race. If we do not destroy this, God will destroy us. We reason and act as if the right of suffrage for the whites were irresistible, undeniable, unimpeachable, indestructible, whatever crimes they may commit. For the black we demand perfect beings, intelligence, virtue, self-denial, submission, patience, heroism, or they cannot have the vote. And at any rate, being guilty of a skin not colored like our own, they have no right to it. If they get it, it must be by an act of great condescension on our part, they having no rights which white men are bound to respect. If we grant the gift, it is only as we judge expedient for ourselves. "*The right of the needy they do not judge.* Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord; shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?"

Can we escape the vengeance, if we admit the crime? At least let us protest, and pray God against it, and in his name demand justice. So, in the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, we may save our own souls alive.

THE FREEDMAN'S SONG.

De Lord, He makes us free indeed
In His own time an' way;
We plant de rice an' cotton seed,
An' see de sprout some day;
We know it come, but not de why—
De Lord know more dan we;
We 'spected freedom by-an'-by,
An' now we all are free.
Praise de Lord! Praise de Lord!
For now we all are free.

De Norf is on the side of right,
An' full of men, dey say;
An' dere, when poor man work, at night
He sure to get his pay;
De Lord, He glad dey are so good,
An' make dem bery strong;
An' when dey called to give deir blood
Dey all come right along.
Praise de Lord! Praise de Lord!
Dey all come right along.

Deir blue coats cover all de groun',
An' make it like de sky;
An' every grayback loafing roun'
He tink it time to fly;
We not afraid; we bring de child
An' stan' beside de door,
An' oh! we hug it bery wild,
An' keep it ebermore.
Praise de Lord! Praise de Lord!
We keep it ebermore.

De mas'er's come back from his tramp,
'Pears he is broken quite;
He takes de basket to de camp
For rations ebery night;
Dey fought him when he loud and strong,
Dey fed him when he low,
Dey say dey will forgive de wrong
An' bid him 'pent an' go.
Praise de Lord! Praise de Lord!
Dey bid him 'pent an' go.

De rice is higher far dis year,
De cotton taller grow;
De lowest corn-silk on de ear
Is higher than de hoe;
De Lord He lift up eberyting
'Cept rebel in his grave;
De negro bress de Lord an' sing
He is no longer slave.
Praise de Lord! Praise de Lord!
De negro no more slave.

—*Harper's Weekly.*

NEGRO PROVERBS.

Wit and Wisdom from West Africa; or a Book of Proverbial Philosophy, Idioms, Enigmas, and Laconisms. Compiled by Richard F. Burton. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1865.

From the (London) Saturday Review.

THE title of this book does an unintentional injustice to the negro race, since the term "Proverbial Philosophy" irresistibly suggests the well-known utterances of the Laureate of twaddle. Even barbarism, however, has its bright side, and the production of a black Tupper is happily reserved for some yet undeveloped stage of African civilization. Up to this time, the negroes have preferred to take Solomon as their model, and though the analogy between *Wit and Wisdom from West Africa* and the Book of Proverbs is neither very close nor very sustained, it is better to have even a faint resemblance of a good model than the most lifelike reproduction of a bad one. The 2,268 proverbs, or proverbial expressions, which make up Capt. Burton's volume were not originally collected by himself; he has simply brought them together from various grammars of the negro languages published by English missionaries, over which they have hitherto been scattered. At first sight this seems a singular occupation for Capt. Burton to be engaged in. Saul among the Prophets was but a feeble type of incongruity when compared with Capt. Burton availing himself of missionary fellow-laborers in the exposition of African character. When we begin to read, however, the mystery is explained. It is Capt. Burton's Moslem proclivities which have induced him to form a temporary Christian alliance. He regards his book, and to a considerable extent regards it truly, as a proof of the elevating influence of Mahommedanism over the tribes which it has made its own. The proverbs are taken partly from the languages of the Negroid or Moslemized races of Senegal and Bornu, and partly from those of the pure negroes of the Gold Coast and the Bight of Benin; and the contrast between the habits of thought which have resulted from Mahommedan training, and those which have grown up under influences wholly or principally Pagan, is very much to the advantage of the former.

In the Wolof and Kanuri proverbs the impulsive and versatile features of the negro temperament are largely colored by the more restrained and philosophical temper which has been engendered by an acquaintance with the Koran. Such sentences, for example, as "He who can do nothing, does nothing;" "The days being finished, there is no medicine;" "At the bottom of patience there is heaven," and several of a similar kind, read exactly like the sententious fatalism of an Arabian sage. The estimate of women again is thoroughly Mahommedan. "If a woman speaks two words, take one and leave the other;" "If thou givest thy heart to a woman, she will kill thee;" "If a man tell his secrets to his wife, she will bring him into the way of Satan"—in all of which the moralist is evidently uncertain whether the sex is to be despised or feared the most. In such a proverb as, "'I have forgotten thy name,' is better than 'I know thee not,'" there is a touch of diplomatic courtesy which hardly belongs to the negro in his untutored State; and there can be no difficulty in tracing the theological origin of such a theory of almsgiving as is involved in "He who tells you to give away your property, deserves your thanks." So also the high estimate of friendship implied in "Hold a true friend with both thy hands" contrasts notably with the cynicism of the pure negro proverbs, "One does not love the same man always," and "If another suffers, a piece of wood suffers." And even the sentiment of "One does not love another if one does not accept anything from him," hardly seems, taken by itself, to justify Capt. Burton's contemptuous comment—"Amongst all Africans, Moslems as well as Pagans, friendship seems to consist simply of giving and taking presents." We should rather be disposed to say that the author of the proverb had discovered the truth that to receive services gladly is a greater proof of affection than to confer them, and had thereby risen considerably above the ordinary savage view of the question. And as an instance of a contrary feeling, it must be difficult even for a European young lady to devise a more cutting speech to an importunate but unwelcome lover than "If thou dost not know hate, dost thou know indifference?"

When we turn from the proverbs of the Moslemized tribes to those of the Pagan races of the Gold Coast, we find that these require a far larger amount of explanation before they can be made intelligible to European readers. The conciseness and power of generalization which distinguished the former has in a great measure disappeared, and is replaced by an excess of figurativeness and a remoteness of analogy which often render the sense exceedingly obscure. For example, "When the fish absorbs the soup, he does it for his master," seems at first sight simply unintelligible. Its meaning however is, that money spent in improving property—the part of the soup which is absorbed by the fish that is boiled in it—is not wasted. "If a boy does nine mischiefs he shall suffer for it five" sounds like a purely arbitrary ratio between crime and punishment, until Capt. Burton adds, "And the father shall suffer the rest," and thus reduces the sentiment to a truism on paternal responsibility. "When the bush is on fire, the pigeon removes from the grass field; when the flame is extinguished, every one returns to his home" has an air of mystery about it, but all that is implied seems to be, that every quarrel comes to an end. Others, again, are not so much proverbs as fables. Thus, to show the recklessness and ingratitude of youth, the Yoruba "proverb" is, "A chicken having been preserved from death (by being shut up) complained that it was not permitted to feed openly on the dunghill;" and the value of enterprise is very happily illustrated by the following:

"A certain man had a most beautiful daughter, who was beset by many suitors. But as soon as they were told that the sole condition on which they could obtain her was to bale out a brook with a nutshell, they always walked away in disappointment. However, at last one took heart of grace, and began the task. He obtained the beauty; for the father said, 'He who undertakes what he says will do it.'"

In opposition to this may be placed, "When a slave becomes free, he drinks rain water," the explanation being that spring water would have to be fetched from a distance, and he does not choose to take the trouble of doing so. It is needless to say that Capt. Burton takes occasion from this to point his favorite moral of the unfitness of the negro for freedom.

Throughout the collection we constantly meet with more or less exact parallels to common sayings in our own language. "If it rained cats and dogs" is represented by "If live coals fell in the bad weather." "If the cap fits" becomes "'There goes a witch! There goes a witch!' If you are not a witch you will not turn round"—which seems, however, to make hardly sufficient allowance for motives of curiosity, or to imply an unusual superiority to them on the part of the negro. "Love me, love my dog" is reversed—"When a person hates you he will beat your animals." The superiority of one "bird in the hand" to "two in the bush" is unknown, but the same idea is expressed by "The palm of the hand never deceives one." The observation of business life which made Solomon write "It is naught, it is naught, saith the buyer, but when he goeth away he boasteth," had led the African to say of the seller, "The trader never confesses that he has sold all his goods; he will only say, 'Trade is a little better.'" "I almost killed the bird; but no one can eat 'almost' in a stew," is exactly our "A miss is as good as a mile;" and "If you cannot dance, you will say, 'The drum is not agreeable,'" is the negro equivalent for "The grapes are sour." So, again, "Beggars cannot be choosers," and "You must not look a gift horse in the mouth," both find a parallel in "He who says 'scratch me,' shall not be scratched where he wishes." The proverbial injunction not to "add insult to injury" has its representative in "The pepper bush by the roadside says, 'if you will break me, break, but do not abuse me;'" and so does "As well be out of the world as out of the fashion," in "When your comrades take snuff and you do not, it looks as if your nails were spoiled." The connection between "The longest way round the shortest way home" and "If you beat a goat you will find its master's house" is less apparent; but the latter is explained by the fact that goats, when they are frightened, run homewards, so that the meaning in both cases is that the least obvious means are sometimes the surest. Even where the resemblance to our own proverbs is less striking, many of these negro generalizations from experience are exceedingly acute. "When the mouse laughs at the cat, there is a hole," and "Though a mouse were as large as a bullock, it would be the slave of the cat," seem to sum up the whole philosophy of the relation between the weak and the strong. A Belgravian mother trying to pooh-pooh a report of a daughter's "entanglement" with some ineligible lover could scarcely be more neatly answered than by "It is nothing! But that is something." If Uriah Heep had been born in negro-land he might have quoted "To prostrate oneself, and keep the elbows close, does something for one," in support of his own theory of "umbleness." Altogether the reader may find a good deal of pleasant and amusing matter in Capt. Burton's volume. We regret, however, to say that its contents show very plainly that the missionaries who are responsible for the translations, however well acquainted they may be with the language of Africa, know very little of their own tongue. More awkward English than that into which almost all the proverbs are rendered, it would be impossible to discover, and almost impossible to conceive. We are compelled to add that, in his notes to his volume, Capt. Burton has in this respect copied the missionaries.

THE CONVENTIONALITIES OF PRONUNCIATION.—What shall we say of the conventionalities of pronunciation, and the mysterious caprice which regulates the value of our British vowels and consonants? In the primers and horn-books of infant life, D, O, G, has spelt dog from time immemorial. But the dandies of the Restoration called that intelligent little quadruped a *dag*, and the dandies of our own time called it a *dawg*. Much commiseration has been felt for the "poor letter H," and the neglect with which it has been treated in cockney dialect. But the letter R is worse off, for its use is being gradually abandoned in those quarters where the purity of the Queen's English is supposed to be most scrupulously preserved. As an initial, it was once the fashion to pronounce it as a W; and indeed it was only the other day that I heard a man speaking of some widiculous ewwor which had cwept into a celebwated dwama, and wemained long there after it had been witten, wead, wepeated and wehearsed. This was an affectation which came in with Lytton Bulwer, and departed with Thackeray. There are few, even of our youngest exquisites, who venture to speak in such accents now. But the R is, nevertheless, slurred over and even omitted by many, who would scout the idea of imitating a natural defect of speech. What has become, for instance, of the final consonant in the word "father. In west country dialect it is still preserved, but in polite circles it is pronounced *fatha;* never, *nevah*, and so forth. Half a century ago, the letter A was similarly used. Old gentlemen still exist who speak of St. Jeames's street and the Peletinete. E and I changed their places. "Arithmetic" was called *arethmetic*, and "messenger" became *missinger*. To this day, Lord Russell declares that he is *obleeged*, and it is a curious proof how extremes meet, that the same expression is adopted by the humblest laborer in Devonshire. The truth is, that when the word was originally borrowed from the French, every one called it "obleeged;" and this provincialism, like many others of the same class, is nothing more than the old-fashioned talk of our forefathers. That our pronunciation not only of English, but of foreign languages, has materially altered with this generation, there can be little doubt.—*London Society.*

SHERMAN'S MARCH TO THE SEA.—Gen. Sherman's report of his glorious Georgia campaign is published. With the principal facts the public is already familiar. His reason for destroying Atlanta and striking for the seacoast are thus briefly stated:

"Hood's movements and strategy had demonstrated that he had an army capable of endangering at all times my communications, but unable to meet me in open fight. To follow him would simply amount to being decoyed away from Georgia, with little prospect of overtaking and overwhelming him. To remain on the defensive would have been bad policy for an army of so great value as the one I then commanded, and I was forced to adopt a course more fruitful in results than the naked one of following him to the Southwest. I had previously submitted to the Commander-in-Chief a general plan, which amounted, substantially, to the destruction of Atlanta and the railroad back to Chattanooga, and sallying forth from Atlanta, through the heart of Georgia, to capture one or more of the great Atlantic seaports. This I renewed from Gaylesville, modified somewhat by the change of events."

Gen. Sherman bestows great praise upon his officers and men for the bravery and efficiency with which they executed his plans. In addition to the railroads destroyed on the march, Sherman says: "We also consumed the corn and fodder, in the region of country thirty miles on either side of a line from Atlanta to Savannah, as also the sweet potatoes, cattle, hogs, sheep, and poultry, and carried away more than 10,000 horses and mules, as well as a countless number of their slaves. I estimate the damage done to the State of Georgia and its military resources at $100,000,000, at least $20,000,000 of which was insured to our advantage, and the remainder is simple waste and destruction. This may seem a hard species of warfare, but it brings the sad realities of war home to those who have been directly or indirectly instrumental in involving us in its attendant calamities."

"LENIENCY" AND SIMILAR WORDS.

To the Editors of the Evening Post:

Don't be alarmed, gentlemen; my purpose is not to treat of treason nor its penalty. As one of your constant readers, I have to thank you for making an end of argument on those subjects. On the contrary, my remarks will be limited to matters philological.

The word "leniency"—if treating it as a belligerent makes it a word—in despite of an occasional broadside in the columns of the EVENING POST and elsewhere, continues to float around on the ocean of letters; and not long ago I saw it in one of the magnanimously solicitous articles of the (London) *Times, in re* Jeff Davis & Co.; and I cite that paper because, among the few good things to be found in it, there is generally good English.

"Leniency" is one of the recently manufactured words which are not needed in our language, which are not justified by the precedents of our language, which never originated with educated men. The thing meant to be expressed by the word is *lenity*, and lenity is English. It is derived from *lenitas*, and Johnson gives *lenity* the noun, and *lenient* the adjective, and also *lenient* and *lenitive*, medical terms. When we come *down* to Webster we find *leniency*; but that lexicographer merely places the word in his vocabulary; he cites no authority for it. Worcester, unfortunately, goes further and fares worse: he cites the *Edinburgh Review*. But although that *Review* is a high authority, neither it nor any other periodical or author can properly sanction an obvious corruption of language. The word is a philological abortion, and cannot be justified on any philological principle. The mere fact of usage, even if general, does not settle the question. That still remains open to review.

I will not here go into an elaborate argument to prove what I think no educated man will deny; but I will cite a few illustrations, which may answer the same purpose.

In looking over "John Halifax," recently, and for the first time, I stumbled on two specimens of this word-manufacture that are tolerably good companions to *leniency*: namely, *conversationalist* and *experimentalize*. I have not looked into any modern dictionary to ascertain whether those words are therein to be found, nor do I care to. If they are not so recorded, I presume they soon will be, for every new lexicographer makes a point of adding several thousand "words not to be found in any other dictionary," and he multiplies himself to the same effect in every new edition of his own work. I should therefore expect, before long, to "find in the dictionary" not only *conversationalist* and *experimentalize*, but,

Conversationalistic,
Conversationalistically,
Conversationalisticableness,
Experimentalizer,
Experimentalizistical,
Experimentalizistically,

and so forth.

In the same category of "words" I will mention two that we have all heard spoken many a time, but I have never yet happened to see either of them in print until yesterday, when I encountered a *walking placard*, to wit: a strapping fellow with a placard on a pole—and he paraded the former of the two in handsome Roman letters, for the benefit of those who desired, not to have "any kind of pain" *cured* but *prevented*. The words are

Preventative,
Casuality,

which are both common enough in spoken language, and one of them has now "got into print."

I would like to inquire of any advocate of "progress" in language:

First—How long a time will elapse before both of those words will get into newspapers, books, and dictionaries?

Secondly—Whether their being so admitted will *ever* make them good English words? and

Thirdly—How much better or worse than "leniency" is any of the ten "words" herein-above recorded? G.

A CASE OF INSUBORDINATION.—Gen. Sherman's refusal to modify his report in a certain particular, which Gen. Grant deemed of sufficient importance to warrant its being returned to him for that purpose, seems to have been overlooked by the press and the public. We print the correspondence between the two Generals elsewhere, and invite attention to the points at issue. Gen. Sherman, in his official report, says that if the army under Gen. Halleck's command had attempted to violate the truce which he (Sherman) had made with Johnston, he should have been bound in honor to defend and maintain it, "even at the cost of many lives." This can only mean that if Gens. Meade, Sheridan, and Wright had entered the State of North Carolina at the head of their forces, in pursuance of orders lawfully transmitted to them, and had moved in a hostile manner against Gen. Johnston, Gen. Sherman would have turned his guns upon them and fought a battle with them to protect the rebels. —*Chicago Tribune*

Advertisements.

A NEW VOLUME! LOOK AT JULY NO.!—Portraits of PRESIDENT JOHNSON—two views; SECRETARY HARLAN; Queen Victoria; the Empress Eugenie; the Emperor Alexander; Julius Cæsar, with Sketches of Character; the Conspirators, and How they Look; the Physiognomy of Classes; Love and Lovers; Second Marriages; Fat Folks and Lean Folks, and how to Cure them, with Illustrations; The Russian, with portraits; Enlarging the Lungs; Immortality of Mind; A Wonderful Prediction Fulfilled; Hymeneal Poetry; Maiden's Eyes; An Appeal from the South; Art and Artists; Practical Preaching; Work-Day Religion; A Hint to Maiden Ladies; Dictionary of Phrenology and Physiognomy, with engravings; Hats, a New Notion, illustrated; Our Country; "Able-bodied Men"; Early Patriots of America, illustrated; Our Finances; The Atlantic Cable, and Americans in England, with much more in JULY DOUBLE NO. PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL. Best No. ever issued. Begins new Vol. Only 20 cents, by return post, or a year for $2. Address FOWLER & WELLS, 389 Broadway, N. Y. 6—2t.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON.—Portraits, two views, with Temperament, Character, and Biography. JULIUS CÆSAR, his Physiognomy and Phrenology, with likeness and Sketch of Character, in JULY NO. PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL. 20 cents. FOWLER & WELLS, N. Y.

FAT FOLKS AND LEAN FOLKS—Cause and Cure of either excess, with Illustrations. Daniel Lambert, Calvin Edson, Banting, etc. Dietetics, effects of Sweets and Acids. How to enlarge the Lungs, in JULY NO. PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL. 20 cents. FOWLER & WELLS, N. Y.

NEW NATIONAL MUSIC.—THE NATIONAL JUBILEE PRIZE SONG.
"Shout, the good time has come,
Our Nation now is free;
Echo the chorus wide,
Proclaim the Jubilee."
This Jubilant and Popular Song ought to be found on every piano, and sung by every patriot on the coming Fourth of July. Price 30 cents, post free. Published by W. JENNINGS DEMOREST, No. 39 Beekman st., and sold by all Music Dealers. Do not fail to get the JUBILEE PRIZE SONG.

HON. JAMES HARLAN, Secretary of the Interior.—Portrait, Character and Biography of this rising Statesman. OUR COUNTRY; Finances, "Able-bodied Men," and how to increase them. Physiognomy of Classes, in JULY—Double—No. Phrenological Journal. 20 cents by post.

NEW AND EXQUISITE MUSIC JUST ISSUED.—THE NATIONAL JUBILEE PRIZE SONG—
"Shout, the good time has come,
Our Nation now is free;
Echo wide the chorus,
Proclaim the Jubilee."
THE WHIP-POOR-WILL SONG, with Echo, by H. MILLARD, exquisitely touching both in words and melody—30 cents.
LOVE ON THE BRAIN, by MRS. PARKHURST—30 cents.
KISS ME WHILE I'M SLEEPING, by KONRAD TREUER, beautiful and artistic—30 cents.
EVERYBODY LOVE SONG—Love in all its phases—30 cents.
W. JENNINGS DEMOREST, No. 39 Beekman st.
Sold by all Music Dealers, or mailed free. 30c., or four for $1.

DEMOREST'S MONTHLY MAGAZINE for JULY, with extraordinary attractions.—National Jubilee Prize Song; Fireworks; Illustrations for Fourth of July; Steel Engravings; Fashions, Household Matters, Original Stories, Illustrated poems, and other novelties. Do not fail to see the splendid July No. Ready on WEDNESDAY.

OUR EARLY PATRIOTS.—Hancock, Jefferson, Franklin, Livingston, Adams, Wolcott, Nelson, Dickinson, Rutledge, Sherman, Huntington, and others, a Group of leading men in the Great Revolution who gave America her Independence—in JULY—Double—No. PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL. 20 cents. FOWLER & WELLS, N. Y.

THE RUSSIAN.—His Past, Present and Future, with three Illustrations. The Samoiedes of Siberia; Portrait of a Native. ETHNOLOGY. The Peruvians, interesting statement by E. G. SQUIER, the explorer, in JULY No. PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL. 20 cents. Newsmen have it.

IMMORTALITY OF MIND.—Proofs of a Future Existence—A wonderful Prediction Fulfilled—ARTS AND ARTISTS—Hats, a New Style proposed—Atlantic Telegraph Cable—Photographs, in JULY—Double—No. PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL. 20 cents. FOWLER & WELLS, N. Y.

THE PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL LIFE, ILLUSTRATED, is a "first-class" magazine, in its 42d Vol., devoted to PHYSIOGNOMY, with "Signs of Character"; ETHNOLOGY, the Natural History of Man; PHRENOLOGY and the Temperaments; PHYSIOLOGY, the Laws of Life and Health; PSYCHOLOGY, the Science of the Soul. Amply Illustrated. Monthly. $2 a year; sample Nos., 20 cents. Address Messrs. FOWLER & WELLS, 389 Broadway, N. Y.